

1690. Also, petition of the Southwestern Millers' League, relative to the Shipping Board, etc.; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1691. By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of citizens of La Salle, Peru, Ottawa, Streator, Utica, and Sandwich, Ill., opposing the sale of the former German ships; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1692. Also, petition of the United Parlor, Native Sons of the Golden West, of San Francisco, Calif., relative to the Phelan amendment; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

1693. Also, petition of the Central Council Committee, small-arms section, Rock Island Arsenal, relative to the manufacture of rifles at the Rock Island plant; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1694. By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of various citizens of Massachusetts, opposing the sale of the 30 former German ships, etc.; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1695. Also, petition of the city council of the city of Boston, Mass., relative to embargo on coal, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1696. By Mr. GOLDFOGLE: Petition of Frank Lanterboon, 67 Columbia Street; Marx M. Friesner, 242 East Broadway; Leo Hirsch, 217½ Seventh Street; Sam Lieb, 568 Grand Street; Irving Lichterman, 7 Pitt Street; A. J. Brenenstork; Miss Sarah Brenenstork; Sam Brenenstork, 403 East Houston Street, all in the city of New York, protesting against the proposed sale of former German ships; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1697. By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Petitions of 32 citizens of the third Rhode Island congressional district, protesting against the sale of the former German ships; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1698. By Mr. LINTHICUM: Petition of the Board of Trade of Baltimore, Md., favoring the Esch-Cummins railroad bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1699. Also, petition of the Egerton Bros., of Baltimore, Md., against the Gronna bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1700. Also, petition of the adjutant general of the State of Maryland, relative to House bill 10835; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1701. Also, petition of the National Exchange Bank of Baltimore, Md., relative to House bill 12379; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1702. Also, petition of Winford H. Smith, superintendent of the Johns Hopkins Hospital, and Edward A. Robinson, of Baltimore, Md., favoring universal military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1703. Also, petition of the Real Estate Board of Baltimore, Md., the Provident Savings Bank, and the E. E. Jackson Lumber Co., all of Baltimore, Md., favoring the Esch-Cummins railroad legislation, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1704. Also, petition of Mr. Bernard Maier and other citizens, of Baltimore, Md., opposing the sale of the former German ships, etc.; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1705. Also, petition of the Maryland State Association of Graduate Nurses, of Baltimore, Md., relative to the Army reorganization bill, etc.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1706. Also, petition of Ed Winslow Gillian, of Baltimore, Md., opposing the universal military training, etc.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1707. By Mr. MANN of Illinois: Petition of F. I. Mann, auditor of the Illinois Farmers' Institute, favoring nitrogen project at Muscle Shoals, Ala.; to the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department.

1708. By Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota: Petition of the city council of the city of Minneapolis, Minn., relative to the high cost of living, etc.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1709. By Mr. TAGUE: Petition of the Metal Trades Department of the American Federation of Labor, urging the defeat of the Sterling-Graham bills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1710. Also, petition of the city of Boston, relative to an embargo on coal, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1711. Also, petition of the Men's Neckwear Cutters' Union, No. 15685, of Boston, against the passage of the Sterling-Graham sedition bills, etc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1712. Also, petition of the Three hundred and seventh Infantry Post of the American Legion, urging universal military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1713. By Mr. THOMPSON: Petition of Van Wert Lodge, No. 667, International Association of Machinists, of Van Wert, Ohio, protesting against the Sterling-Graham peace-time bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

## SENATE.

FRIDAY, February 20, 1920.

(Legislative day of Wednesday, February 18, 1920.)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Glass	Kirby	Poindexter
Ball	Gore	Knox	Ransdell
Beckham	Gronna	Lenroot	Robinson
Borah	Hale	Lodge	Sheppard
Capper	Harris	McKellar	Smith, Ga.
Chamberlain	Harrison	McLean	Smith, Md.
Colt	Henderson	McNary	Smoot
Culberson	Hitchcock	Moses	Spencer
Curtis	Johnson, S. Dak.	Myers	Sterling
Dial	Jones, N. Mex.	Nelson	Thomas
Dillingham	Jones, Wash.	New	Townsend
Edge	Kellogg	Norris	Trammell
Fernald	Kendrick	Nugent	Walsh, Mont.
Fletcher	Kenyon	Overman	Warren
France	Keyes	Page	Watson
Gay	King	Phipps	Williams

Mr. GRONNA. I was requested to announce that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is absent due to illness. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. DIAL. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. SMITH of South Carolina] is detained by illness. I ask that this notice may continue during the day.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have been requested to announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] is detained from the Senate by illness in his family.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] is detained by the illness of a member of his family.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY] is detained at home by illness.

Mr. POMERENE. The Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] are absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-four Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

## INTERDEPARTMENTAL SOCIAL HYGIENE BOARD (S. DOC. NO. 230).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the United States Interdepartmental Social Hygiene Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement showing the activities of the executive departments and establishments pertaining to the public health and the amount expended on account of each of these activities, which was referred to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine and ordered to be printed.

## DISPOSITION OF USELESS PAPERS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Assistant Secretary of Labor, transmitting a schedule of useless papers devoid of historic interest on the files of the Department of Labor, and requesting action looking to their disposition. The communication and accompanying paper will be referred to the Joint Select Committee on Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments, and the Chair appoints the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. FRANCE] the committee on the part of the Senate. The Secretary will notify the House of Representatives thereof.

## WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a certified copy of a joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Arizona, ratifying the Susan B. Anthony amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right of suffrage to women, which will be filed.

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice President:

S. 796. An act for furnishing water supply for miscellaneous purposes in connection with reclamation projects; and

S. 2454. An act for the relief of certain members of the Flat-head Nation of Indians, and for other purposes.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, so far as my recollection serves me this is the first time since my service began as a Member of this body when I have asked for time to make a statement which most vitally concerns my most immediate relatives and myself.

In the issue of the Washington Herald under date of February 18 there appeared an editorial which was evidently written for the purpose of doing me great harm. Similar articles have appeared in other papers. These articles have evidently all been inspired by either Mr. Hoover or Mr. Barnes, or by both.

On February 13 I addressed the Senate, giving my views with reference to the services of Mr. Barnes in connection with a very important industry. My criticism against Mr. Barnes was directed entirely against him because of the mistakes which I then believed, and which I still believe, he has made. I have criticized Mr. Hoover as food director. I have charged that during the war he committed a gross injustice against the farmers of this country. But instead of answering the criticism which I directed against these distinguished gentlemen, who in some parts of our country have been denominated as the "Gold Dust Twins," instead of answering the charges made against them they proceed to attack me personally, and the article in the Washington Herald and in the Baltimore Evening Sun of Tuesday, February 17, falsifies the record of my votes in this body in a most malicious manner.

Mr. President, I have here the Record. I was charged in these articles with having voted against the bond issues. I have here the vote upon the act providing for the first bond issue under date of April 17, 1917. The Record shows that I voted for it. I have the Record of the act of September 15, 1917, known as the second bond act. Upon that act there was no record vote. Upon the third bond act there was no record vote on the final passage of the act. On the fourth bond act there was no roll call or record vote.

I have the act known as the War Finance Corporation act under date of March 7, 1918. There was a record vote on the final passage of the bill and the Record shows that I voted for it. I also have the Record of the passage of the fifth bond act, and I find that there was no record vote on the final passage of the act.

I wish to say, Mr. President, that if I was present when any of these acts passed, in every instance when they were passed by a viva voce vote, I voted for them.

Mr. President, I have on several occasions stated in this Chamber that I wish to be understood that I have neither regrets nor any apology to make for the votes I have cast in this body, but I warn these people now, whether they are British agents or representatives of the millionaire clubs of this country, that when an attack is made upon me they must not falsify the official records.

I have never attempted to deny, and I never shall deny, that I voted against the declaration of war with Germany. I have never attempted to deny that I voted against conscription and that I voted against the espionage act, and the only statement that will be found to be true in the article of the Herald and other papers with reference to my votes is the reference made to the votes on the three measures which I have just mentioned. The charge that I voted against the bond bills and the appropriation bills is maliciously false. Again and again I stated upon this floor that I would vote for any amount of money required to most vigorously prosecute the war. I never made a criticism against a single appropriation made during the war. I did criticize the revenue bill, because I wanted to increase the rate of the tax imposed upon excess profits; but I was not alone in this effort; there were a great many Senators who voted as I did and who argued that it was a mistake not to increase the rate of tax to be imposed upon excess profits during the war. Later on the President of the United States asked that the tax in the following revenue bill be increased. I am not mentioning this as a criticism of those who differed with me, but I am making this statement simply for the purpose of showing the facts, and I say now that not one vote was cast by me against any bond bill or any appropriation necessary for the purpose of carrying on the war. On the contrary, the records will show that when a record vote was asked for upon a bond bill or upon an appropriation bill when my name is recorded it will be found as voting for it, and not against it. So far as I know there was no opposition to the appropriation of any amount of money needed.

Mr. President, if I alone could bear the burden of the malicious lies uttered against me by those papers I might do so without complaining, but I want the Record to show that the charges made in the articles referred to are absolutely false.

On the declaration of war with Austria it will be found that I voted for it. We were actually at war with Austria, and so long

as we were actually at war with this nation I preferred to carry on that war in a legal and constitutional way.

These gentlemen who have succeeded in perfecting the most complete organization possible throughout the entire country manifest that they possess the cunning animal instinct of directing the people's attention from the questions at issue, but in that way, it seems to me, they plead guilty to the criticisms made against them.

I have studiously avoided, as I said on last Friday, bringing in any undue criticism based merely upon rumors. I had a great many reports sent to me, but I did not use them. I had the report of the grand jury in the State of Washington with reference to Mr. Howser, one of the vice presidents of the Grain Corporation, who was indicted by the grand jury in that State. But as an indictment is only a complaint or a charge, the charges may or may not be true, and for that reason I did not use it. I have not charged these men with being crooks or rogues, but I am reminded of what Theodore Roosevelt once said:

I know how to deal with a crook, but I can do nothing with a natural-born fool.

And it might be interesting to these men to know that at the very time when I am charged as voting against these appropriations necessary to carry on the war, there were five Gronnas in the service; three of them were already on the battle fields of France. All of them came from the Dakotas; two of them were the sons of my oldest brother, who died several years ago, and who were supporting a widowed mother. One of them was only 17 years old when he entered the service; none of them had to be drafted. My youngest son entered the service before war was declared. They all entered the service as privates. One of them was promoted while acting as a doughboy to the rank of corporal; one of them was promoted to the rank of sergeant; and my youngest son was promoted on the field of battle to the rank of a first lieutenant in the Heavy Artillery. All of them have been honorably discharged. It is true that their lives were spared, but they came back shell-shocked and nerve-racked, and both their mental and physical abilities were impaired for a time.

Now, in simple justice to these boys who served in the trenches and upon the fields of battle, and who fought through the Verdun, Metz, and Meuse and other battles, until the armistice was signed—I say in simple justice to these boys who for months fought upon the fields of battle, and who saw strangers and friends torn to shreds—I ask that the records of this body be given as they actually are.

I repeat that my family did as much to win the war as any other family in this country. It ought not to be necessary for me to state that from a financial standpoint I did more than I was asked to do. But that is a small matter. I only did what every other patriotic American citizen should do; but I thought that this campaign of pro-Germanism was about over. I was in hopes that the abuse heaped upon thousands of good, patriotic citizens of German descent was about to end. I was in hopes that we were about ready to take up the question of reconstruction, and to make it possible for these boys to go on and help perpetuate this as the greatest Nation on earth in obedience to the wishes of the fathers. I was in hopes that it would be possible for citizens of English, of Irish, of Scandinavian, of Italian, of German, or of any other ancestry to get together as Americans and to work together as Americans for the benefit of the people of this great country, the United States of America.

Mr. President, I should waver in that hope if it were not for the fact that we know from the teachings of the immaculate Master and from the teachings of the great men who followed Him that, in the words of Solomon, "The lip of truth shall be established forever, but a lying tongue is but for a moment."

## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. CAPPER presented memorials of sundry citizens of Portland and of Norton County and Marshall County, all in the State of Kansas, and of sundry citizens of Collinsville, Okla., remonstrating against compulsory military training, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland presented a petition of Admiral John Rogers Post, No. 28, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Maryland, of Havre de Grace, Md., and a petition of Hicks Post, No. 24, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Maryland, of Easton, Md., praying for the passage of the so-called Fuller pension bill, which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PHELAN presented a petition of Crockett Post, No. 30, American Legion, of California, praying for an additional bonus for ex-service men, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

## FEDERAL LIVE-STOCK COMMISSION.

Mr. GRONNA. I am directed by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to which were referred Senate bill 2199 and Senate bill 2202, to stimulate the production, sale, and distribution of live stock and live-stock products, and for other purposes, to submit a report (No. 429), accompanied by a bill (S. 3944) to create a Federal live-stock commission, to define its powers and duties, and to stimulate the production, sale, and distribution of live stock and live-stock products, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

## BILL INTRODUCED.

Mr. KING (by request) introduced a bill (S. 3943) to establish the standard and decimal divisions of the weights, measures, and coins of the United States, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Standards, Weights, and Measures.

## INTERNATIONAL PEACE CONFERENCE.

Mr. FRANCE. I introduce a joint resolution, which provides for the reestablishment of peace with Germany and for the calling of an international conference dealing with the great problems which are not met by the treaty which is before us. I ask that the joint resolution be printed in the Record and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 159) providing for the reestablishment of peace and the calling of an international conference to formulate plans for international cooperation was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows: Joint resolution (S. J. Res. 159) providing for the reestablishment of peace and the calling of an international conference to formulate plans for international cooperation.

Whereas on the 11th day of November, 1918, the President of the United States announced the signing of an armistice between the United States and the powers with which the United States had been at war, the President at that time declaring "the war thus comes to an end"; and

Whereas it is most desirable that there shall be a prompt termination of the status of war by the formal legal reestablishment of peace between the United States and Germany; and

Whereas the peace treaty submitted to the Senate for ratification contained provisions for a new coalition of nations, of which the United States was to be a member, and called for a guaranty by the United States under article 10 of that treaty of the territorial integrity of the great empires of Great Britain, of Japan, and of France, and for other arrangements repugnant to the United States, which caused the rejection of that treaty by the Senate; and

Whereas there is a profound unrest throughout the world, due in large part to the failure of the Paris peace conference to formulate such plans for peace and for international cooperation, for the advancement of justice, liberty, and the general welfare, as would commend itself to the great liberal spirit of the age and the new enlightened conscience of mankind; and

Whereas the long-continued underproduction and rapid destruction during the war of the necessities and commodities of life, particularly of food, have resulted in a serious shortage, which makes imperatively necessary an immediate reorganization of all agricultural, industrial, financial, and commercial activities for the maximum production in all countries and for the distribution among the nations by the normal methods of trade and commerce of such food, necessities, and commodities; and

Whereas because of the close community of financial, industrial, and commercial interests of all of the nations of the world, the industrial and financial prostration and paralysis of Germany, Austria, Russia, and other recently belligerent countries of Europe, with the necessarily ensuing unemployment, impoverishment, and starvation of their citizens, with the threatened unrest and revolution in certain of these countries, are impeding the rehabilitation and are menacing the peace of the world and the stability of all government: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved, etc.*, That the status of war with Germany, declared by the Congress by S. J. Res. 1, on the 5th day of April, 1917, be, and it is hereby, declared to be terminated and the full status of peace be, and it is hereby, declared to be reestablished.

2. That the President be, and he is hereby, authorized and advised to make treaties of peace without annexations or indemnities and of trade and intercourse with the Republic of Germany, all matters of dispute between the two countries to be submitted for arbitration to The Hague tribunal.

3. That in pursuance of this resolution declaring the reestablishment of peace, all American troops now upon foreign soil shall be immediately returned to the United States.

4. That the President is hereby authorized and directed, by invitations to be sent out by him during the month of May, 1920, to invite the States signatory of or adherent to the Convention for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes, of July 24, 1899, and their successors, and all other States since recognized or which may be recognized prior to the sending out of the invitation, to send three delegates each, and also two delegates in behalf of each of the colonies, protectorates, and dependencies, respectively, of the various States having colonies, protectorates, or dependencies to assemble in conference at Washington, on a date in November, 1920, to be fixed in the invitation, to consult concerning the formation of a more perfect general concert and union, the establishment of general justice, the assurance of the general tranquility, the promotion of the general welfare, and the securing generally of the blessings of liberty to the peoples now living and to their posterity.

5. That the list of said States to be invited shall include the following: Argentine Republic, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Finland, France, Germany, Great Britain,

Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Hejaz, Hungary, India, Italy, Japan, Jugoslavia, Luxemburg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Persia, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Roumania, Russia, Salvador, Serbia, Siam, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, Uruguay, and Venezuela.

6. That the invitations shall be expressly with the understanding that there shall be an international conference of the States, composed of three delegates from each of the States, and an assembly of the colonies, protectorates, and dependencies, composed of two delegates from each of the colonies, protectorates, and dependencies, the international conference and assembly of the colonies, protectorates, and dependencies to sit separately but at the same time. The purpose of this international conference and of the assembly of the colonies, protectorates, and dependencies shall be the formulation of plans for international cooperation, but all resolutions agreed upon or instituted either in the international conference or in the assembly of the colonies, protectorates, and dependencies shall be of an advisory character, and any international or pannational organs or processes initiated or instituted shall be of a voluntary nature; and on the further understanding that this international conference and its assembly of the colonies, protectorates, and dependencies shall be the first of a series of periodical conferences of similar character, which shall establish a system of advisory correspondence, with continuation committees sitting in the intervals between the conferences to prepare for the international conferences and to carry on the system of correspondence. The more specific objects of the international conference, the assembly of colonies, protectorates, and dependencies, and of the continuation committees and the purpose of the correspondence between the States participating shall be—

(a) To consider the common and mutual interests and the social and economic relations of the State and peoples of the world.

(b) To recommend projects of uniformity, reciprocity, or cooperation in the action of the States, respectively.

(c) To formulate a body of international law based on the security of the fundamental rights of the individual as the prime function of all Governments and for applying as between States the analogies of the laws of partnership and cotenancy, and as between States and their respective colonies, protectorates, and dependencies the analogies of the laws of conservatorship, guardianship, and trusteeship.

(d) To devise methods for the advancement of the peoples of colonies, protectorates, or dependencies from the status of dependencies to that of independence and to full participation in the international conferences.

(e) To promote cooperation among the more advanced nations for the improvement and advancement of the backward countries and territories, particularly those of Africa and parts of Asia, by the formulation of plans for the reclamation of waste land, for the utilization of natural resources, including water powers, for wise colonization, for the promotion of education and the spread of civilization throughout the world.

(f) To consider the problems of the congestion of some and the underpopulation of other nations and the unregulated competition between the more populous and industrial countries for the trade and raw products of the less populous agricultural ones.

(g) To study the problem of international finance, credits, and exchange, with a view to the prompt shipment on suitable credits, particularly into Russia, Germany, Austria, China, Africa, and any other agriculturally or industrially undeveloped or prostrated countries, of tools, agricultural implements, seeds, and other materials necessary to production, as well as foodstuffs, necessities, and commodities, for the purpose of encouraging a resumption of production which will be favorable to the rehabilitation of the world.

(h) To localize hostilities between States by cooperative policing of the high seas or otherwise and to take such action in case of such hostilities that the result of any armed conflict between States may be to increase the area within which the rights of the individual are effectively secured and to render more perfect the union of all the States for mutual aid and benefit.

(i) To make further provision for the pacific settlement of international disputes and for the settlement of those disputes according to accepted principles of law and by due process of law.

(j) To encourage the establishment, where stable governments do not exist, of constitutional republics or governments of such character as would make for that national stability upon which could be based a permanently peaceful international order.

(k) To promote amity and mutual understanding between the oriental and occidental peoples and to proceed with all possible means and speed to conciliate the people of Russia, China, India, Afghanistan, the Central Powers, and Turkey, in order that these nations or countries may not form against the western powers a hostile coalition which might menace the peace of the world.

(l) To consider the social and economic relations of the States and peoples of the world as naturally and necessarily united for mutual aid and benefit, and to concert measures accordingly.

6. That nothing in the programs or plans shall be contrary to the foregoing which, in the opinion of the Congress of the United States, should be regarded as the specific aims and objects of the conferences.

7. That the functions of the United States as the initiator and host of the international conference and the assembly of the colonies, protectorates, and dependencies, shall be in the charge of a committee, which shall come into existence in the month of April, 1920, and shall consist of the then Secretary of State as chairman, the then Secretary of the Treasury, the then Secretary of Commerce, two Members of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and two Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The delegation of the United States to the international conference and to the assembly shall be nominated to the President by said committee, and said nominees when approved by the President shall be appointed by him by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The said committee shall also suggest to the international conference and to the assembly a program—a plan for organization, a plan for the continuation committees, and for the system of correspondence.

8. That the general expenses of the international conference and of the assembly shall be borne by the United States; each participating State, however, paying the salaries and expenses of its own delegates and of the delegates in behalf of its colonies, protectorates, and dependencies.

9. That there is hereby appropriated, out of any sums in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the carrying out of the provisions of this resolution, the sum of \$15,000,000.

10. That the provisions of this resolution shall take effect immediately after its passage and its approval by the President.

## OBSERVANCE OF THE SABBATH.

Mr. McKellar. Some weeks ago I received a request to introduce a bill against Sabbath breaking. I desire to put into the RECORD, without reading, the letter preferring that request, my reply thereto, and a copy of the proposed bill.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NASHVILLE, TENN., January 1, 1920.

Hon. K. McKellar,  
Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR BROTHER: At the recent session of the Tennessee Annual Conference of the Methodist Ministers and Laymen a resolution was unanimously adopted urging the building of public sentiment and the enactment of State and national laws to stop Sabbath breaking, an evil now endangering our children, our people, and our Nation. We were appointed a committee by that conference to urge upon our President and Congress, and especially our Tennessee Congressmen, the enactment of laws to prohibit all professional baseball playing on Sunday, the operation of moving-picture shows and all theaters on Sunday, the publication of advertising in and circulation of all Sunday newspapers, the operation and using of all freight and passenger trains on Sunday, all trading on Sunday, and the carrying on of any vocation for profit on Sunday, emergency cases of charity and necessity only excepted. This action of our conference was based upon the commandment of our God to honor the Sabbath day and keep it holy, a commandment we must keep if we would save our people and our Nation from destruction.

Acting under appointment by said conference, we have prepared and herewith hand you a bill to prohibit Sabbath breaking in so far as our Nation under its present Constitution has power to do so; and we respectfully beg you to introduce this bill in Congress and to do your utmost to have it enacted into law. We pledge you the hearty cooperation of our conference and, as we believe, of the Christian sentiment of America. This bill, if enacted into law, will stop all interstate trains and traffic on Sunday, will stop the circulation of Sunday newspapers through our postal facilities, and will stop all persons who act under authority of or under the employment of our Government from carrying on their ordinary vocations on Sunday. We earnestly beg your most prayerful consideration of this matter and your most zealous cooperation. As soon as the bill is introduced and referred to the appropriate committees in the Senate and House we shall be pleased to appear before them and state our reasons in full and to meet any possible argument or opposition that may be offered.

Assuring you of our best wishes and begging of you an early and favorable reply, we are,

Very sincerely, yours,

NOAH W. COOPER,  
W. R. WEBB,  
E. B. CHAPPELL.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

1. Hereafter it shall be unlawful for any person in the employment of the United States to work or carry on his ordinary vocation on Sunday.

2. It shall be unlawful for any person or corporation to operate on Sunday any freight or passenger train, or mail train, or any other train, or part of a train, on Sunday in the carrying on of interstate commerce, trade, or traffic of any kind.

3. It shall be unlawful for any post office to be open on Sunday or to deliver mail on Sunday; it shall be unlawful for any mail to be carried or delivered on Sunday by any employee of the United States, whether in city or country.

4. It shall be unlawful for any newspaper or other paper or publication published or purporting to be published on Sunday to be received, carried, or delivered as mail by any agency of the United States, in any post office, or over any route under the jurisdiction of the United States.

5. It shall be unlawful for any person or corporation engaged in interstate commerce or carrying on any business or vocation under the laws of or with the permission or license from the United States, or any of its agencies, to do or carry on any ordinary vocation or business on Sunday, the purpose of this act being to express our national determination to honor the Sabbath day and keep it holy, as God commands, thereby securing for all that opportunity for spiritual and bodily refreshment decreed by our Lord for the happiness of all men and the safety of all nations.

6. Any person who does any of the things above declared unlawful, or who procures or aids another in doing any of the things above declared unlawful, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and punished upon conviction by due process of law by a fine of not under \$100 nor over \$10,000 for each offense, and by imprisonment for not over six months, in the discretion of the court.

7. And any corporation that does or aids in doing these forbidden things shall upon conviction be fined not less than \$1,000 nor over \$100,000 for each offense, and upon conviction a second time for like offense shall forfeit its charter and franchise and be enjoined from operating in interstate commerce: *Provided, however*, That emergency instances of charity and necessity are not included nor punishable under the provisions of this act.

NASHVILLE, TENN., January 30, 1920.

Hon. K. McKellar,  
Senate, United States of America, Washington, D. C.

DEAR BROTHER McKellar: On January 1, 1920, our committee from the Methodist Conference by letter asked you to introduce a bill, prepared by us, to prevent national Sabbath breaking, in so far as Congress had power.

We regret not hearing from you. As chairman of the committee and for them I write to beg you to introduce this bill. We will support it and we feel sure it will have the support of millions. It is our God-given duty. We inclose you a copy of the resolutions our conference adopted, which you might use as a preamble to the bill. We are anxious to have your active support of this bill. It speaks, as we believe, the voice of Christianity for the safety of our Nation.

Please kindly let us hear from you at once.

With best wishes,

Yours, respectfully,

NOAH W. COOPER,  
Chairman of the Committee.

Hon. N. W. Cooper,  
McGavock Block, Nashville, Tenn.

MY DEAR MR. COOPER: Your letter of the 30th ultimo and also your letter of the 1st ultimo asking me to introduce a bill prohibiting passenger, mail, and freight trains from running on Sunday, and also prohibiting Sunday newspapers and all other vocations and amusements, emergency cases of charity and necessity only excepted, under the control of Congress from operating on Sunday, received and noted.

These letters should have been answered before. They have not, because I have been thinking about the proposition contained in them and have been making inquiries among Senators about the chances of passage of such a bill.

Again, I am in doubt whether this is the way to proceed in the matter. I am not in the least doubt about the question of Sabbath breaking, because I do not believe in Sabbath breaking, but I am in serious doubt whether a bill of this kind would afford a solution. I was born and reared in the Presbyterian Church, having been a member of that church practically all my life. I have all of the Presbyterian views about the Sabbath, but we Christian people in this country have stood by and have seen firmly entrenched as habits and customs of our people every form almost of Sabbath breaking. Even some of our ministers defend certain Sunday amusements like baseball, and many of our leading church members—probably the most of them—indulge in one form or another of Sabbath breaking.

The running of trains, freight and passenger, the use of the telephone and telegraph, the carrying of mails, riding and driving in automobiles, and to a more or less degree nearly every other kind of work or business or amusement, when deemed important or excusable, is done on the Sabbath. Indeed, the most of us have indulged in one or another form of Sabbath breaking ourselves. The great body of the public have become accustomed to these forms of Sabbath breaking.

Now, to undertake to restore an observance of the Sabbath by Federal law, without inculcating the wisdom and duty of Sabbath observance in the people at home, seems to me certainly to be the wrong method of approach. These movements must win public favor locally first and then spread, as notably prohibition and suffrage. In my judgment this movement for Sabbath observance should first take firm hold of the churches and the churches should take an unquestioned and firm stand. If they should become of one mind on the subject, the reforms that you speak of could be much better accomplished.

To introduce a bill in Congress to stop all interstate trains, interstate traffic, interstate freight, interstate news, interstate mail, interstate telephonic communication, interstate telegraphic communications, and Sunday newspapers would undoubtedly give a legislator very considerable notoriety, but it would not, in my judgment, and according to views expressed here, in the slightest degree change the ugly fact of Sabbath desecration. I have not suggested the matter to a single legislator here who has approved. All say that the bill would die in the committee, or could not in any event get anywhere in the Senate.

For these reasons it seems to me that it would serve no useful purpose now to introduce such a bill. I believe it would be much better to organize the churches and other local Sabbath-observance societies first, and if successful the movement would undoubtedly spread until action of the kind you suggest would be possible.

With great respect and best wishes and regretting very much to differ with you about the method of securing a much-needed and desirable observance of the Sabbath, I am,

Sincerely, yours,

## WAGES OF COAL MINERS.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have read from the desk, for the information of the Senate, a statement of Dr. Garfield relating to the wages of coal miners.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Assistant Secretary read as follows:

"Dr. H. A. Garfield, former Fuel Administrator, in an article written for Farm and Home, declares:

"The wages now paid to mine workers are sufficient. The opportunity that should be the mine workers' can not be secured merely by an increase in wages.

"An average of \$950 a year was earned by the lowest-paid miners working 180 days in the year, while for 200 days' work the average miner in the bituminous fields of Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois earned \$1,600 in 1918 and \$1,800 last year. This is 'more by a considerable sum than the average net receipts of the farmer and many others who may or may not work 300 days or more in the year.'

"The public ought not to be asked to pay more for coal. It is impossible to increase the wage of the mine workers without inciting the workers in every other industry, including, of course, agriculture, to demand an increase in wages. This would send the cost of living upward in a vicious spiral, which will in the end prove hurtful to the workingman. The purchasing power of the dollar, and not the number of dollars received, is the important factor.

"The public is chief sufferer when the capital and labor engaged in the production of commodities necessary to the support of life fall a-fighting. In these cases certainly the interest of the public is vital, and therefore paramount. We may admit the right to strike on the part of labor and the right of capital to boycott, but in each case the right of the public to live is paramount, and will be asserted.

"We now are called upon to contemplate an arrangement with a group opposing the Government which, however it terminates, is unsound in principle and a menace to our institutions."

Mr. BORAH. May I ask from whom that came? Who is the author?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Dr. Garfield.

Mr. BORAH. Is it a telegram?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. No; it is a statement made in a periodical to which he contributes.

Mr. BORAH. I merely wish to say at this time that that is a very inadequate statement of the wage situation with reference to the coal miners.

#### AGRICULTURAL INTERESTS.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the commissioner of agriculture of Texas to Mr. Curtis, the editor of the Country Gentleman, in regard to Mr. Hoover's association as food administrator; also an editorial upon the same subject from Wallace's Farmer.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
STATE OF TEXAS,  
Austin, February 3, 1920.

Mr. CYRUS H. K. CURTIS,  
President Country Gentleman,  
The Curtis Publishing Co., Philadelphia, Pa.

MY DEAR SIR: I have with much pleasure followed your editorials concerning the problems of the farmers and the Government in general, but it pained me to read in your Country Gentleman of January 31 an editorial backing Mr. Hoover for President, presumably as a farmers' candidate. I am sorry that this editorial appeared in the light of making Mr. Hoover a farmers' candidate and fear it will lessen your influence with the farmers of this country, which I very much regret, because the farmers need a great journalistic champion and have appeared to have much to hope for from your publications for that nation-wide support which agriculture as a nation-wide industry must have.

One can understand why the big packers, the grain, cotton, and other corporations—in fact, the middlemen in general and profiteers in particular, as well as certain European nations which were furnished American-grown food for less money than those nations could grow it themselves—would be anxious that Mr. Hoover be elected President. But I can not see how any man who is familiar with the acts of Mr. Hoover as Food Administrator and with the feelings of the farmers of this country could presume to boom him for President in the interest of American agriculture. The justifiable indictments which the producers of this country could bring against Mr. Hoover would be many indeed.

To begin with, Mr. Hoover based his administration as food dictator upon an assumption that the farmers of this country would not liberally support the war and its various activities, and that through political cowardice Congress would not make them do so. Following this assumption, he planned to have the middlemen make all the profits possible, expecting Congress to force them to finance the war.

Mr. Hoover did more to cause profiteering than any other one man. Profiteering is the greatest disturbing factor in the Nation's peace to-day, and the least talked about by officials who appear anxious to restore peace and plenty. Mr. Hoover's estimate of the patriotism of the American farmers was belied all through the war, and when Congress failed to make him dictator of prices he assumed the authority and used it to lower prices to the farmers and increase profits to the dealers.

He gave confidential advice to the big packers as to when they should buy hogs and cattle, and through the power of his office lowered the market at the time he advised them to purchase.

Under a period of time covering his administration green cowhides dropped from 14 cents per pound to 6 cents per pound, and certain brands of shoes advanced from \$6.50 a pair to \$12.50 a pair. I took this matter up personally with Mr. Hoover, and he claimed he had no authority to correct it. If he did not have authority to correct such glaring abuses, he should have had. He did not even use official pressure to make correction.

It must not be forgotten in this connection that he always found a means, even though he had to misrepresent the law, to hold down the price of the farmer's wheat and other farm products. The willful abuse of the authority conferred by Congress relative to the price of wheat is so well known and condemned throughout the Nation that it is not necessary to discuss it here.

Expecting a 16,000,000-bale crop of cotton, he held up the regulation of cottonseed prices until the market received the weight of the heavy movement of seed. Later, when rapid deterioration of the cotton crop showed that the 16,000,000-bale estimate was much too high, he waited until the importation of oriental oils were at maximum and then ordered regulations of cotton seed made at a time when oriental oils were at such maximum, causing American producers to meet this competition from the Orient. In this connection I wish to say that the importation of these oils from the Orient and elsewhere increased some 400 per cent during a four-year period of the war, a time when it was a nation-wide cry, headed by Hoover, that war-torn Europe was in dire need of both animal and vegetable fats. The ships were found to carry this oil to this country at an increased rate of 100 per cent per year, while ships could not be found to carry cotton to neutral countries, although neutral countries were badly in need of cotton and this country was all the time exporting fats to relieve Europe.

Mr. Hoover permitted thousands of cars of onions to rot in the fields of South Texas, thereby wasting food and hurting our growers. At the same time he shipped onions from the Atlantic seaboard to the Army camps at San Antonio and other Texas camps near the fields where onions were wasting; yet we had a constant cry of not only a shortage of food, but a shortage of cars.

This is a free country—or is supposed to be—and everybody has a right to their choice for President. But do not rub it in on the American farmers by putting Hoover forward as the farmer's candidate, when they know full well that millions of dollars of Liberty bonds, War Savings stamps, and Victory bonds held by other people, and for which other people get the credit from the standpoint of patriotism, were purchased with money which was unfairly taken from the farmer's pockets by Mr. Hoover.

You undertake to give Mr. Hoover credit for the increased acreage of wheat last year and relieve him of any responsibility for the decrease in acreage this year. The credit for whatever increase in the wheat acreage last year was due to a hope of profit, belongs to Congress and not to Hoover. The only credit he can claim is in his causing the intentions of Congress to fail, and thereby unfairly taking from the wheat growers what they were entitled to receive. He practically the same thing to the hog growers. His live-stock man sent word to the big packers that while the price fixed on hogs was a minimum price it would please Mr. Hoover if they would not advance much beyond the minimum.

It does not look well to see a great journal, speaking editorially, to make such comparisons as you make concerning the wheat acreage of last year and this. You must know that all the stimulus which the act of Congress created Mr. Hoover killed, and the reduction this year is due to disappointment and lack of profits on the part of growers, together with a shortage of labor, bad weather, and poor transportation facilities. In short, every influence Hoover brought to bear was negative.

Having in my official capacity made several trips to Mr. Hoover's office, and there met with representatives of farmers from all parts of the country, and having discussed his acts with official representatives of farmers since then, I feel confident that if Mr. Hoover's backers should be able to secure his nomination for President thousands of farmers in the United States would take the stump against him and the party who should put him up. The time has not yet come when the people of these United States want even a near-English subject for President, and Mr. Hoover, in environment and business, is practically an English subject.

Very truly, yours,

FRED W. DAVIS,  
Commissioner.

[Editorial from Wallace's Farmer, Feb. 13, 1920.]

#### WHAT'S THE MATTER WITH THE FARMER?

Under date of January 30, a press dispatch was sent out from Washington, which began as follows: "Indications of a widespread spirit of unrest and dissatisfaction among the farmers of the country so threatening as likely to disturb the existing economic structure is considered by Government officials to be revealed in more than 40,000 replies to a questionnaire recently sent out by the Post Office Department."

It seems that about 200,000 copies of a sheet containing questions for farmers to answer were sent out throughout the agricultural States. The farmer was requested to answer them and return them to the Post Office Department. When about 40,000 of these replies had been received the Post Office Department people became alarmed, and Mr. Blaklee, one of the assistants to the Postmaster General, went before the Senate Post Office Committee and told them about it, saying: "Such a condition at a time when the predominant cry is for production and still more production can not but constitute a grave menace." And one of the Senators said the replies seemed to have come from a bunch of Bolsheviks.

The replies made by farmers to the questions sent out are exactly what any man who has been familiar with agricultural conditions would anticipate. They tell the story of the difficulty in getting farm help, of long working hours, of the low prices of some agricultural products as compared with the cost of production, and of the steady drift from the farm to the city, because the city offers easier hours and higher wages. They point out that while prices of farm products have been beaten down as far as possible, the prices of food products to the consumer have increased as well as the prices of practically everything the farmer has to buy. It is an old story to people who have been in touch with farm sentiment, but it seems to have come with a rude shock to the folks at Washington, and they have become quite excited about it.

This dispatch from Washington was played up in the daily papers of the United States under rather startling headlines. For example, it was given the first column on the first page of the New York Times, which is generally looked upon as the greatest newspaper in the United States, under the display headline, "Farmers' unrest a grave danger, officials find." Similar headlines were used by other dailies throughout the country. Even in the Central West, where knowledge of agricultural conditions ought to be expected in the offices of the daily press, we find such headlines as "Spirit of unrest among farmers menace to United States," giving the impression that the farmers of the country are in a dangerous state of mind.

When we use the word "unrest" in these days we involuntarily think of Bolshevik activities, or something of that sort. Now, the fact is that no class of people in the United States are so little tainted with socialistic and bolshevistic doctrines as are the farmers. The farmer is the great conservative force of the country. He is intensely patriotic, has no use at all for either the long-haired parlor Bolshevik who wishes to set up a government of free love, or for the I. W. W.'s, Socialists, anarchists, and other folk of that sort, who want to upset all forms of government and confiscate for their own use all forms of property. The farmer believes in stable government, in schools, and churches, and homes. He is the balance wheel, the stabilizing force. To the extent, therefore, that the dispatch from Washington gives the impression that the farmer is in a condition of unrest which might end in an effort on his part to upset established government, the dispatch is a base libel.

What, then, is the matter with the farmer? Why is he dissatisfied? Why have the farmers of the Central Western States organized themselves so thoroughly in the Farm Bureau Movement? Why have they raised such large sums of money to be used in promoting this movement and its purposes? Why is this organization being extended so rapidly to other States? Why has the National Farm Bureau Association been formed? What is the farmer going to do?

The answer is easy. The farmer is getting tired of being made the goat.

That does not mean that he proposes to make a disturbance, or try to overturn the Government, or start a new political party, or confiscate property. Nothing of that sort. It means simply that he feels that it is time he was looking after his own business interests; that he is determined to secure fairer prices for the things he has to sell; that he proposes to set up whatever business institutions may be necessary to help him to sell and buy to advantage. It means above all that he sees that it is time for him to study the business game and learn how to play it for himself, just as other people have learned to play it for themselves. And especially it means that he is tired of being double-crossed not only by other business interests but by people who are in places of authority in Government. He is thoroughly sick of Government price fixing and Government operation of railroads, and Government meddling in general.

If we were asked to name one man who is more responsible than any other for starting the dissatisfaction which exists among the farmers of the country, we would instantly name Mr. Hoover. What has Mr. Hoover to do with it? Well, here's the story:

When the United States entered the war there was every reason to believe that it would be a long war. With so many men withdrawn from production, a long war meant serious food difficulties.

Therefore the appeal was made to the farmers of the United States to produce food and produce abundantly. Especially was there need for increased pork production. Mr. Hoover said that a plentiful supply of lard and bacon was as urgently needed as a plentiful supply of guns and ammunition. But there seemed to be a question as to whether we would be able to produce as many hogs as were needed, because the price of corn was so much higher relatively than the price of hogs; that is, the farmer was offered more money for his corn sold as corn than he could get by feeding the corn to the hogs and selling it as hogs instead of as corn. Therefore the tendency was to produce fewer hogs and sell more grain.

When Mr. Hoover began to study this situation he found in the files of Wallace's Farmer certain studies on hog production which extended back for a period of over 30 years. He found there evidence to show that when hogs sold in Chicago for less than the value of 11.67 bushels of corn hog production decreased, and that when they sold for more than this hog production increased. So he decided to stimulate hog production by assuring the farmers that if they would produce hogs they would get a higher price relatively for their hogs than they would get for their corn as corn. He therefore announced, in November of 1917, that, so far as he could influence prices, he would try to make the hogs farrowed in the spring of 1918 fetch a price per hundredweight when ready for market which would be equivalent to the value of 13 bushels of the corn fed into them.

This promise made by Mr. Hoover was given the widest publicity. He printed it in pamphlet form and circulated it throughout the United States. The farm papers, the professors in the agricultural colleges, everybody who had a chance to talk to the farmer or write for him told about this promise and assured the farmers that, no matter what happened, if they would only produce more hogs they could be sure that they would get a price for them that would yield them more money than they could get if they sold the corn.

Farmers took this promise at its face value. They believed what everybody told them, and the result was that they very greatly increased the number of hogs. They regarded Mr. Hoover's promise as a promise of the Government—which, in fact, it was, because Mr. Hoover was acting for the Government—and they had full faith in Uncle Sam. They felt that he would make his word good. They had been losing money on hogs right along, but now they thought they could produce them safely at a profit.

The time came to make good the promise. The new price was to be applied to the pigs farrowed in the spring of 1918, which would go to market in the fall and winter of that year and the early months of 1919. What happened?

In October of 1918 it became apparent that Mr. Hoover did not propose to carry out his share of this arrangement made with the farmers. He announced that hogs would sell during the month of October for about \$18 per hundredweight. This was about \$2.50 per hundredweight less than he had promised to try to make them sell for. He also announced that a minimum price of \$15.50 would be maintained on hogs, which would mean a loss of about \$5 per hundredweight, based on the price he had promised. Shortly afterwards he announced a scheme upon which he proposed to try to make good the promise he had made. It was such a barefaced juggling of figures as is seldom seen and aroused widespread indignation throughout the hog-producing country.

If Mr. Hoover had said frankly that hog production had exceeded his expectations and that, much as he regretted it, he did not believe it would be possible for the Government to make good its promise the farmers would have felt disappointed, but they would have accepted the situation as a war loss. But when he tried to evade his promise by juggling the figures and at the same time pretended to keep it the farmers lost patience and they lost faith as well. They felt that Mr. Hoover, and through him Uncle Sam, was trying to make them the victims of a straight confidence game. It was a hard jolt. Mr. Hoover should not have made a promise if he had not intended to keep it. Having made it, he should have kept it to the letter or frankly acknowledged that he could not do so. He asked for hogs and he got them. He promised a certain price and then tried to get out of paying it, and succeeded, in part. Of course, he thought he was doing the right thing; that the end justified the means. But he was mistaken, and his mistake has caused a lot of trouble and will cause more.

That was really the beginning of what the daily press now calls "unrest" among the farmers. In the meantime, there were the efforts to beat down milk prices. Farmers who had been selling milk to the cities had been losing money right along, just as they did on hogs, simply because they had to pay prices for grain and hay that were higher than they would sell for in the form of milk. Consequently, milk production was decreasing and the price was going up. The Food Administration people, either directly or indirectly, tried to work the same game on the dairy farmers that they worked on the hog producers, and with the same result.

Then came the price drive, early in 1919, when prices of corn and other farm products were beaten down without cause, and the second and more successful price drive in July and August of 1919, when, led by Attorney General Palmer, everybody turned on the farmer and smashed him as hard as they could. The result was that the farmers of the country suffered the loss of millions upon millions of dollars and the consumers of the country got no corresponding benefit. Instead of dropping, prices to the consumer have advanced right along.

The farmer is less suspicious and more trustful than other people, but he does not need to be hit over the head with a sledge hammer more than two or three times before he realizes that something is wrong. He is thinking clearly now, all right. He sees that price making is a great, big game and that it is time for him to learn it. Heretofore he has been producing without asking any questions as to the prices he will get. He has been taking what the other fellow has been willing to give him. Now he sees that the price he gets for the things he produces is the important thing. Other people have been getting a price which covers the cost of production and, in addition, a fair profit. That is what the farmer is going to expect in the future. It may take him some time to get it, but he is going to get it or quit. He will have to.

The farmer furnished more than 25 per cent of all the fighting men in Uncle Sam's armies, and after the boys had gone to war the older men and the women and the girls and the children turned to and

produced more food than ever before in all the history of farming in the United States. While other people were being assured of the cost of production plus a fair profit—and sometimes more—the farmer took his chances. He thought that he would be treated fairly. Anyhow, the farm folks felt that it was their country and their war and that it was up to them to do everything they could to win it, no matter what the results might be financially. While other people were working on an eight-hour-day basis at tremendous wage advances, the people on the farms were working from 12 to 16 hours. They did not complain about this; they just worked. Our soldier boys had to be fed and our allies had to be fed, and it was up to us to feed them.

But now the war is won and the treatment the farmer has received from other folks during the past year has not been pleasant. Almost everybody else has been letting up in their work, decreasing the number of hours, demanding increased wages, and getting them. But they want the farmer to continue to work on the war-time basis and reduce his prices to a peace-time basis. It won't do. The farmer does not propose to stand for it. He is not going to start any revolution nor anything of that sort. He is just going to study the business game and adjust his business to the situation. He is going to demand fair prices for his products and back up this demand by organizing and studying the game and learning how to get them.

The farmers of the corn belt mostly have made money during the past five years. On the whole, it has been a prosperous period for them. Prices generally have ruled high, although prices of live stock have been lower relatively than prices of grains, and consequently the live-stock feeder who has had to buy his grain has at times lost a great deal of money. Land has advanced tremendously in value and many farmers have taken advantage of this to cash in and retire.

In view of this generally prosperous condition, many people have difficulty in understanding why the farmer should complain. They do not see that the great increase in the price of land, the increase in price of farm labor, and everything else the farmer has to buy stimulates a condition which the farmer has very good reason to fear. If we could be assured of continued high prices for farm crops, the feeling of dissatisfaction among farmers would gradually evaporate. With prices as they have prevailed during the past two years there would not be much trouble in paying interest on the high-priced land or in paying rent. But there is every reason to believe that after 1920—and certainly after 1921—prices for farm crops will rule very much lower, and it will then be exceedingly difficult for any but the most skillful farmers to make money on present land values.

The cry from the cities and industrial centers is for cheap food, and our experience of the past shows very clearly that they are going to do everything they can to get it, and that without considering the farmer's cost of production. Most of the agitation against the high cost of living is directed against the farmer, and our officials, both State and national, as well as our Representatives in Congress, are susceptible to agitation of this sort from the cities. The effort will be made to bring in cheap grains and cheap meats from other countries, where land is cheap and living standards are low, and use these imports to beat down prices of stuff produced at home.

It is therefore because of fear of what is going to happen to him that the farmer is organizing to protect himself. He has learned something during the past three years. He sees very clearly that unless he can get prices for farm products which will be high enough to pay interest on the money invested in land and equipment, plus fair wages for himself and his boys, plus enough more to maintain the fertility of his land, our agriculture will decline. And throughout the corn belt there is the fear that we may have to go through the experience of the farmers of Pennsylvania, Ohio, and the Eastern States following the Civil War, when the flood of cheap grains and meats which followed the opening of this great western country simply smothered the eastern farmers, reduced immensely the price of their land, and compelled them to move west in large numbers.

If the Federal Government and the daily press could only be made to see this whole situation, there would be a fair chance to work out of it. Really it is a matter of greater importance to the Nation as a whole than to the individual farmer, because the latter can take care of himself. But we have had no national agricultural policy. No one in authority has seemed able to visualize just what has happened and what is likely to happen to our agriculture. So there is nothing left for the farmer to do but make a fight for prices that will enable him to maintain a sustaining agriculture and, failing that, to look after No. 1.

The people connected with the Federal Government and the people of the cities should not make any mistake in this matter. They should get it out of their heads that this unrest among farmers is a menace to established government. The fact is that the farmers believe in established government and love their country more deeply and will sacrifice more for it than any other class of people in the United States.

#### LANDS AT MILITARY POSTS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. SPENCER submitted the following conference report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8819) to amend an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1919, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 16, 22, 28, 29, 30, and 31.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 20, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, and to the title of the bill, and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following: "at Camp Taylor, Ky., and in no event later than June 30, 1921"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an

amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following: "\$236,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

SELDEN P. SPENCER,  
GEORGE E. CHAMBERLAIN,  
MORRIS SHEPPARD,  
IRVINE L. LENROOT,  
*Managers on the part of the Senate.*  
JULIUS KAHN,  
DANIEL R. ANTHONY,  
THOMAS S. CRAIG,  
S. HUBERT DENT, JR.,  
*Managers on the part of the House.*

Mr. OVERMAN. I should like to ask the Senator about Camp Bragg. Does that provision remain in the bill as it passed the Senate?

Mr. SPENCER. The provision relating to Camp Bragg remains in the bill just as it came from the House.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

#### PRESIDENTIAL APPROVAL.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Sharkey, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had, on the 19th instant, approved and signed the act (S. 3371) authorizing Gordon N. Peay, jr., his heirs and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the White River.

#### SALE OF SHIPS (S. DOC. NO. 231).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying paper, ordered to lie on the table and be printed:

*To the Senate:*

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of a resolution passed by the Senate on February 14, requesting the President to inform that body "whether any, and if so, what, agreement or understanding exists between him and the officials of Great Britain concerning the disposition by the United States of America of the German ships which the Shipping Board is proposing to sell, or which were acquired by the United States after the termination of hostilities between said United States and the central European Teutonic powers."

The ships for the purchase of which bids have been asked by the Shipping Board were taken over by Executive orders issued pursuant to the joint resolution of Congress of May 12, 1917, authorizing the President to take over for the United States the possession and title of any vessel within its jurisdiction, under enemy ownership, or under the registry of an enemy country. The Government of the United States is not in possession of any ex-German vessels except those taken over under this resolution. Under an armistice agreement between the German Government and the allied and associated powers certain German vessels were taken over primarily for the transport of food to Europe, including Germany, and for the transportation of troops. Of the tonnage so taken over, certain passenger vessels were allocated to the United States temporarily for the purpose of repatriating American soldiers. When the transportation of our troops was completed, these vessels were all surrendered in accordance with the agreement under which they were temporarily allocated to this Government for such use.

There is not, nor has there been, any agreement or understanding between the President of the United States and officials of Great Britain concerning the sale of the ex-German vessels in possession of the United States, nor is there any agreement or understanding with respect to what disposition shall be made of those ships by the United States.

I believe the above information fully answers the Senate's inquiry. However, I am transmitting herewith a draft of a proposed understanding in regard to ex-enemy merchant tonnage to which I have given assent, subject to future action of Congress, as provided therein. Although this understanding, which recognizes American rights with regard to German vessels taken in our ports, does not relate to the disposition of such vessels by the United States, I am, nevertheless, transmitting it in order that the Senate may be in possession of all the information there is in any way relating to the vessels in question. I had intended to submit this to Congress at the appropriate time, after the ratification of the treaty with Germany.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE,  
20 February, 1920.

#### HERBERT C. HOOVER.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD the remarks of Mr. Hughes respecting Mr. Hoover, as published in the New York World of Thursday, the 19th of February.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HUGHES ACCLAIMS HOOVER IN GIVING CIVIC FORUM MEDAL—CARNEGIE HALL CROWD CHEERS AT HIGH TRIBUTE PAID HIM FOR DISTINGUISHED WAR SERVICE—ACCEPTS HONOR FOR ARMY OF MEN WHO HELPED HIM—WARNS AGAINST "DANGER OF PARTISANSHIP" IN DUTIES BEFORE US—SPEECHES BY OTHERS.

"Such a wave of enthusiasm as is rarely manifested by a New York gathering swept to its feet, cheering, an audience that packed Carnegie Hall last evening, when Herbert Hoover received from the hand of Charles E. Hughes the Civic Forum's medal for distinguished public service.

"When there came a lull in the tumultuous, prolonged applause, Robert Erskine Ely, director of the Civic Forum, called for three cheers, in which every member of the gathering joined.

"The recipient of the tribute was manifestly moved. Color flooded his face as he thanked the donors of the medal, declaring that he felt it was meant as much for the great body of Americans who have helped him in his tasks as for himself.

"In this tribute," he said, "there should be recognition of my colleagues throughout the whole United States, who gave their services, first that Belgium might be preserved, and then that the life of Europe might be maintained down to the signing of peace.

"The years of contact I have now had with my countrymen in bitter trial have demonstrated that there are thousands equal to leadership. There is, indeed, a definite and fine sense of voluntary sacrifice throughout the whole American people, which has been developed in this war to a degree never before equaled in the world.

#### DANGER OF PARTISANSHIP.

"It has the one fine quality of self-sacrifice. It realizes that service is the underlying element of democracy. We are confronted with many and complex problems, and it is our duty to guard against the danger that selfishness and partisanship will overwhelm our sense of duty to the greatest number."

"Mr. Hughes, chairman of the meeting, in his opening address, said that in paying tribute to Mr. Hoover's merits 'we are seeking without reference to class, without regard to party or to politics, to honor a great civilian hero of the World War.'

"Long before America realized her duty in the great struggle," he continued, "she was profoundly gratified that, in the person of Hoover, her humane sentiment was finding expression in an organization of unsurpassed effectiveness for the relief of Belgium. Hoover, as administrator of relief, was at once financier, diplomat, and statesman. He came into contact with the Governments of the Allies and with the despotism of the Central Powers. At all points he was ready, equipped, firm, fearless, and adequate.

"It would have been impossible for any human being, or any conceivable group, to have handled this gigantic undertaking to the satisfaction of everyone. But no one doubted that to that task Hoover brought the best ability anywhere available. And, later, Europe recognized his preeminence as an organizer, in selecting him to administer the vast sum appropriated for feeding the war-stricken peoples, and as a member of the supreme economic council of the Allies.

#### HUGHES RECOUNTS RECORD.

"In the midst of men of valor, men of exceptional talent, men of affairs, and those skilled in large enterprise, there is one who stands out with a unique reputation because of the rapidity with which he was able to formulate wise plans and the extraordinary degree of success with which he executed them.

"His record prior to the war was that of successful enterprise in many lands. When the hour struck the man was ready. It is a source of peculiar pride that we recognize in him whom we honor to-night those gifts which, found to be invaluable during the war, especially illustrate American ability and character in the field which opens the greatest promise in time of peace.

"The Americanism of Hoover is shown in every deed, in every utterance. His achievements dignified the Nation and established prestige for the American name abroad which even the mistakes of diplomacy can not obscure. He bears a name illustrious because of remarkable achievements; but, best of all, it is a name untarnished, expressive not only of exceptional ability but of the simple life of a modest citizen.

#### A STIMULUS TO AMBITION.

"In truth we are here not so much to honor him as to recognize our duty to appreciate great public service and to stimulate, especially among the youth of our country, the most worthy

ambition. It is well for America that we give honor not simply to military and naval heroes, not only to distinguished officers of State, but to a man of the people, who served his country with honor by the most notable service to the world.

"Other speakers were President Ray Lyman Wilbur, of Stanford University, Mr. Hoover's alma mater; Horace Vaughn Wipchell, Mr. Hoover's predecessor as president of the American Institute of Mining and Metallurgical Engineers; President Aurelia H. Heinhardt, of Mills College, Calif.; and Henry Morgenthau, former ambassador to Turkey.

"The Civic Forum medal has been conferred only three times previously, the other recipients having been Alexander Graham Bell, Thomas A. Edison, and George W. Goethals."

#### DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12046) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and prior fiscal years, and for other purposes.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, on behalf of the committee I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Wyoming will be stated.

The READING CLERK. On page 16, after line 2, it is proposed to insert the following:

To enable the Secretary of the Treasury to carry out at once the provisions of paragraphs (a) and (b) of section 7 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to provide hospital and sanitarium facilities for discharged, sick, and disabled soldiers, sailors, and marines," approved March 3, 1919, the limit of cost of the acquisition of the site and uncompleted building and completion and construction of the hospital buildings at Cook County, Ill., authorized by said act, is hereby increased from \$3,000,000 to \$3,500,000, and for the purpose of carrying the foregoing authorization into effect there is hereby appropriated the sum of \$500,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, this amendment involves a matter which heretofore has received a great deal of attention. It is a subject which became involved in a rather labyrinthine way, so that it became very difficult to adjust. This hospital was authorized by a special bill providing hospitals for soldiers. It was begun after the authorization of the expenditure of \$3,000,000, and in fact was nearly completed, when, by reason of the practical closing of the war, the Secretary of War turned the whole matter of hospitals and the care of sick soldiers after discharge over to the Public Health Service.

A hospital prepared for soldiers differs from a hospital prepared for the Public Health Service, and many changes were necessary to be made in the construction of this hospital. The contract was originally signed by an officer of the Army, who was relieved from that particular position soon afterwards, and before the return of the Secretary of War, who was then in France. The Secretary of War failed to sign the original contract because of his absence, and the matter was being turned over to the other organization. The Public Health Service from time to time has varied in its recommendations. So the matter was left where the Secretary of the Treasury was unable to complete the hospital properly under the original contract, and it seems was unable to effect a new contract with the builders. The Committee on Appropriations was then appealed to for some changes in the language of the law in order to enable the Secretary of the Treasury to proceed. Therefore, in a former deficiency appropriation bill, an amendment was included. That, however, proved ineffectual, and in the appropriation bill preceding this one—that is, the first urgent deficiency appropriation bill—another change was carried. Now comes at this time the amendment which I have offered, and which, as it was presented to the committee, carried numerous other provisions.

The committee refused to go further in this matter unless there was agreed upon an absolute settlement which would not exceed certain boundaries. Not having received anything up to nearly the closing hour of yesterday, nothing was included in the bill in reference to the matter, but last night came the information from the Secretary of the Treasury that an agreement had been arrived at. This morning the chairman of the Appropriations Committee has been in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury for a half hour and has gone over the entire matter from A to Z.

The Secretary assures me that if the amendment, which I submitted to him, is adopted he will struggle yet to complete the hospital for the uses of the Public Health Service for the amount originally agreed upon, but that it can not be done without arranging beforehand a list of changes, which he proposes to do under a renewed contract.

Mr. President, I will ask that the proposal which I hold in my hand may be read at the desk. It involves a question sent from the Secretary of the Treasury to the contractor and also submitted to the regularly employed attorney of Mr. Shank

and Mr. Hines, who have furnished the money with which to build the hospital.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the paper presented by the Senator from Wyoming will be read.

The Assistant Secretary read as follows:

Will your people agree to sell the site and complete the buildings known as the Broadview Hospital, Chicago, Ill., according to the revised plans and specification for \$3,000,000, minus the \$73,770.87, plus an amount sufficient to cover any increases in wages and cost of materials over the schedules prevailing in the market in Chicago October 10, 1919, found by the Supervising Architect, with the understanding that the absolute final cost, including said sum of \$73,770.87, shall not exceed \$3,500,000, with the further understanding that the cost of the project shall be reduced by such amount as may result from cheapening expedients agreed upon?

Copy of the agreement signed February 19, 1920.

Answer. Yes.

SHANK & Co.,  
By GEO. H. SHANK, President.

Yes.

WILLIAM S. BENNET,  
Attorney for the Owner.

NOTE.—If not, for what sum will your people sell the site and complete the buildings according to the plans and specifications, without any qualifications, provisos, or reservations whatsoever?

Mr. WARREN. The signatures to that communication are those of the contractor and of the attorney. Mr. President, I move the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, when this matter was before the Senate on a former occasion I recall that the then Secretary of the Treasury, now the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], very vigorously opposed the purchase of the so-called Speedway Hospital. I think that the opposition of the Secretary would have triumphed in this matter had it not been for the statement made by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON]. We have such great confidence in him that when we understood that he was for the proposition I know it abated very much of the opposition that existed in regard to this matter.

Mr. President, there have been a number of communications sent to me from various sources, some in favor of this proposition and some violently opposed to it. Some of the statements which have been made were to the effect that a gross fraud was being perpetrated upon the Government; that the building would not provide the number of beds which had been represented; that the cost was entirely disproportionate to the advantages and benefits to the Government. One statement made to me by a person who claimed to have made some investigation was to the effect that each bed would cost, as I remember, \$3,000. Another gentleman, who claimed to have some knowledge of this matter, reported to me that there had been some scandal in connection with the purchase of it, and it was charged—and an investigation, as I recall, was had—that a large sum was paid by way of commission to the person who sold this project. There have been so many charges and countercharges in regard to this matter, Mr. President, that I shall be very glad if some further explanation can be made in regard to it.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, the statement of the Senator from Utah invites me to an explanation respecting this amendment.

Some months ago I introduced in the Senate a resolution to investigate the necessity for Government hospitals required to make provision for the treatment of sick and disabled soldiers. As a result of that investigation the Secretary of the Treasury was authorized to acquire the hospital involved in this amendment and a number of other hospitals at different places.

During the course of the investigation it appeared conclusively from the evidence that some seven or eight subordinate authorities of the War Department had signed a contract with the Shank Co. for the construction of this hospital. The contract contained the usual emergency clause contemplating procedure immediately with the construction. The Secretary of War, however, had not signed the contract. He himself was then, if my recollection serves me correctly, in France, and Assistant Secretary of War Crowell was Acting Secretary of War. The evidence upon the part of some four or five witnesses was to the effect that a real estate agent in the War Department had approached the owner of this property on one occasion, and his attorneys on another occasion, and asked for a fee of \$100,000 as a consideration to recommend the adoption of the project. The evidence further tended to show that he claimed the project would not be approved without his favorable recommendation.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President—

Mr. ROBINSON. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. LENROOT. I should like to suggest to the Senator that that charge was made by the owners of the property themselves.

Mr. ROBINSON. The owners of the property refused his proposition and filed affidavit with the Secretary of War charg-

ing the employee in the War Department with this breach of duty and alleged criminal conduct. The affidavits were referred, very properly, to the Department of Justice for investigation and action. I know nothing of what has occurred since that time in connection with the charge.

I point out to my friend, the Senator from Utah, that the evidence tended to show that the request for a fee of \$100,000 came from an employee of the Government; that he claimed to be a real estate agent in the city of Chicago, and claimed a fee because of his occupation there, being engaged at work in the War Department for a nominal consideration. So far as I know and so far as the record shows, that is a fair statement of the transaction referred to in connection with the fee. The hospital project has been investigated some five or six times by the War Department or representatives of the War Department, and without exception the report has always been that this hospital—and I call the attention of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROO], who is familiar with the subject, to this statement—is not only the best hospital available for the Government's use but that it provides accommodations cheaper than any other hospital which the Government has been able to obtain or has in prospect; that it is a modern, up-to-date, fireproof hospital, furnished at a less cost per bed than the frame fire traps that have been used elsewhere throughout the country.

That is the undisputed evidence in the matter. The subject has been gone over a number of times by Congress, and it ought to be disposed of now. In the general hospitals act, which was reported by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds as a result of the resolution of investigation which I mentioned in the beginning of my statement, was contained this language:

SEC. 7. By the construction of new hospitals and sanatoria, to include the necessary buildings with their appropriate mechanical and other equipment and approach work, including roads leading thereto, for the accommodation of patients, officers, nurses, attendants, storage, laundries, vehicles, and live stock on sites now owned by the Government, or on new sites to be acquired by purchase or otherwise, at the places hereinafter named.

Then, omitting a proviso which gave the Secretary of the Treasury discretion to select better sites or hospital projects at less cost, the act provides:

(a) At Cook County, Ill., by taking over the land and executing the contract for the construction thereon of hospital buildings specified therein of a certain proposed contract executed by the Shank Co., August 31, 1918, and in accordance with such contract and the plans and specifications, identified in connection therewith August 31, 1918, by the signature and initials of Brig. Gen. R. C. Marshall, jr., Construction Division, Quartermaster Department, United States Army, by Lieut. Col. C. C. Wright, and the Shank Co., by George H. Shank, president, at the cost stated therein, namely, \$2,500,000, with such changes in said plans and specifications as may be required by the Secretary of the Treasury to adapt said specified buildings to the needs and purposes of the Public Health Service, at a total limit of cost not to exceed \$3,000,000.

(b) In carrying the foregoing authorization into effect the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to execute the contract with the Shank Co. hereinbefore specified, with such verbal changes as are made necessary by a change in the contracting officers, and to assume all obligations in said contract contained, and to purchase materials and labor in the open market, or otherwise, and to employ laborers and mechanics for the construction of such buildings and their equipment as in his judgment shall best meet the public exigencies, within the limits of cost herein authorized.

Under that provision the Secretary of the Treasury did not close up the matter; and when the urgent deficiency appropriation bill was passed, approved December 24, 1919, after a full discussion of the matter then, this provision was inserted:

#### HOSPITAL AT BROADVIEW, COOK COUNTY, ILL.

That so much of an act entitled "An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and prior fiscal years, and for other purposes" (Public No. 5, 66th Cong.), as reads as follows: "The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby directed to acquire and complete immediately the hospital at Broadview, Cook County, Ill., authorized and appropriated for by an act entitled 'An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to provide hospital and sanatorium facilities for discharged sick and disabled soldiers, sailors, and marines,' approved March 3, 1919" (Public act No. 326, 65th Cong.), is hereby amended so as to read as follows:

"That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, directed immediately to acquire the uncompleted hospital building at Broadview, Cook County, Ill., and the site thereof, consisting of 320 acres, more or less, and to cause the work on said hospital building to be completed and the five proposed auxiliary buildings to be constructed in accordance with plans and specifications transmitted to the Shank Co. July 15, August 16, and September 23, 1919, and the appropriation therefor contained in the act entitled 'An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to provide hospital and sanatorium facilities for discharged sick and disabled soldiers,' approved March 3, 1919, together with such further changes in said buildings as may be found necessary or desirable."

Thus it appears that in three separate acts of Congress this matter has been gone over, and the Secretary of the Treasury has been instructed to acquire this property and proceed with its completion: First, the general hospitals act, approved March 3, 1919; second, the urgent deficiency appropriation act, approved June 30, 1919; and third, the urgent deficiency appropriation act, approved December 24, 1919.

As the matter now stands, the existing law not only authorizes but requires the acquisition of this property. It requires the Secretary of the Treasury to proceed with the completion of the hospital. The amendment which the Secretary of the Treasury has submitted, through the chairman of the committee, authorizes an addition to the limit of cost of \$500,000. The Shank Co. binds itself to complete the entire project in accordance with the revised plans within a limit of \$3,500,000, and the Secretary hopes that it may be completed for less than that sum; but it is necessary, in order to avoid the possibility of a deficiency arising, to accept this amendment. I think it ought to be accepted. The matter has been held in abeyance long enough. It has been investigated over and over, not only by authorities in the War Department but by the committees of the Senate, including the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, which reported the original hospital act authorizing the acceptance of this project.

Mr. KING. Mr. President—

Mr. ROBINSON. I yield with pleasure to the Senator.

Mr. KING. I wanted to ask my friend whether or not the maximum sum named now will include the purchase of the 160 acres to which he has referred?

Mr. ROBINSON. My information is that it will.

Mr. KING. May I inquire of the chairman of the committee on that subject?

Mr. ROBINSON. Yes; certainly.

Mr. KING. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee whether the \$3,500,000 will cover the cost of acquiring the 160 acres of land?

Mr. WARREN. Absolutely; and I want to impress upon the Senator, further, that I have the most solemn assurance of the Secretary himself, within the last hour or hour and a half, that under the offer and acceptance which was read from the desk they are bound to furnish this land and to complete this project under the original contract, with such changes as may be agreed upon, and the Secretary hopes that it may not exceed the \$3,000,000, or not exceed it very much; but he is unable to make any promises, and he is unable to get any contract, unless there is latitude enough and longitude enough to cover these needed changes from the original plans of the Army to the Public Health Service. And I am not sure but that the land may be 320 acres instead of 160 acres.

Mr. KING. The Senator also should include the word "altitude."

Mr. WARREN. So I think the question and answer cover the ground completely.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

Mr. ROBINSON. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS. Before the Senator takes his seat, let me ask whether the amendment contemplates the appropriation of \$3,000,000 in addition to the money which was carried by the hospital bill of last year?

Mr. WARREN. Not at all. This is in express terms \$500,000, or so much of it as may be necessary, in addition to the \$3,000,000 appropriated in the special hospital bill long ago.

Mr. KING. May I inquire of the Senator from Arkansas whether this amount will complete the five buildings to which the Senator referred in his remarks a few moments ago?

Mr. ROBINSON. My understanding is that it is intended to carry out this project, with such modifications as have been agreed upon. I agree with the Secretary of the Treasury that the arrangement is a good one for the Government. I think the project in the beginning was the very best that has ever been submitted to the Government, and that is the conclusion that has been reached by all the committees that have investigated it. No one who ever went into the subject, in so far as I know, reached any other conclusion than that it was both the best and the cheapest hospital facility that the Government has acquired or can secure. The limit of cost has been heretofore fixed at \$3,000,000. This amendment simply raises the possible limit of cost by \$500,000, which is necessary to meet the changes that the Secretary of the Treasury finds are required in order to make this hospital available as a Public Health hospital. The Senator understands that it was originally begun as an Army hospital.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator advise us what the original cost of the hospital was when it was designed as an Army hospital?

Mr. ROBINSON. I think it was \$2,500,000. I am not sure about that.

Mr. KING. So that this increases it \$1,000,000?

Mr. ROBINSON. The total increase from the original plans, perhaps, has been a million dollars.

Mr. KING. Does the Senator know whether or not the number of beds in the hospital will be larger under these new plans than under the old ones?

Mr. ROBINSON. No; I can not state as to that. My information is that a large portion of this new work is in connection

with the buildings to which the Senator has referred, which are required for the accommodation of the employees of the hospital, and are not themselves immediately connected with the main hospital building.

Mr. KING. While this is perhaps not germane, can the Senator advise us of the reason for the acquisition of so many hospitals by the Public Health Service? Let me premise that question, before the Senator answers it, by a statement.

During the war, as the Senator knows, a large number of hospitals—some temporary, and some of very great value—were acquired or erected by the Government. We had in the neighborhood of 2,000,000 men, or nearly that number, at one time in our cantonments and ports and military reservations throughout the United States. In order properly to care for this vast number, of course, a large number of hospitals were necessary. In addition we now have a large number of soldiers' homes, which may be converted at very little expense into suitable hospitals, some of which are scarcely inhabited, because the old soldiers are fast passing away.

It has occurred to me, and that suggestion has been made by many, that with the hospitals that the Government owns, plus the old soldiers' homes, there is no necessity for these additional hospitals, and that the demand which has been made, or the suggested demand, of \$85,000,000 for Public Health hospitals is wholly unwarranted and wholly unfounded. Can the Senator give us any information in respect to those matters?

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I do not feel sufficiently informed at this time to undertake a detailed and accurate statement regarding the Public Health hospital program, but in so far as the particular project under consideration is concerned Congress has determined in three separate acts that the Government should acquire this hospital, and the liability of Congress under those acts already has been fixed. Now, undoubtedly the settlement of the matter which is comprised in the amendment sent to the Senate by the Secretary of the Treasury is the very best for the Government that can come about. I do not agree with the Senator from Utah, if I correctly understood the implication of his statement, that the existing hospital facilities are adequate for the requirements of our returned soldiers; and while I have not been into the subject fully, I think the Senator will find that other facilities than those already authorized will be required by the Public Health Service as the years go by, but whether that be true or not this is the best proposition that the Government has had. The Government, at enormous comparative cost, has acquired a number of frame hospital buildings subject to fire, exceedingly dangerous to occupy. This hospital is absolutely fireproof. It is badly needed, according to all of the information which has come to me, to meet emergency requirements; and if there is any criticism that can fairly be made of the course that this matter has pursued, it is to the effect that the Government has been too long deprived of the use of this very valuable hospital, which it has committed itself to acquiring by three separate acts.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBINSON. I yield with pleasure to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. LENROOT. I will say to the Senator from Utah that when this committee, of which I was a member, made its investigation the first thing it did after concluding its hearings was to ascertain what Army hospitals might be turned over to the Public Health Service. The Secretary of War and the Public Health Service could come to no agreement, and finally the committee compelled an agreement by which the Secretary of War turned over a number of the Army hospitals to the Public Health Service, and that was done in that legislation. In addition, this hospital was provided for. A bill had come to the Senate from the House appropriating, I think, \$9,000,000 and we reduced that appropriation by several million dollars, taking the Army hospitals and this hospital; but the committee, realizing at the time that additional appropriations would be necessary for the Public Health Service, refused to do it at that time, with the idea that as time went on there might be other Army hospitals that might be turned over to the Public Health Service.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMOOT. I offer the following amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the proposed amendment.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 2, after line 9, insert the heading "Bureau of Efficiency" and the following:

To enable the Bureau of Efficiency to perform the duties imposed upon it by the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act approved March 1, 1919, \$20,000.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. STERLING. I ask the Senator from Utah to state a little more particularly the object of the proposed amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. I can do it in very few words, Mr. President. The Bureau of Efficiency was requested by the Secretary of War, the Assistant Secretary of War, the Director of Finance, and the Quartermaster General to make a survey of those departments, with a view of eliminating unnecessary employees, as far as possible, and also to make recommendations with reference to certain work which was considered as a duplication. That work was done at a cost of \$20,000. It has saved to the Government already \$250,000. I will say to the Senator further that the report also recommended changes in the Quartermaster's Department that will save \$5,000,000 a year to the Government.

Mr. STERLING. It is for work already done?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; for work already done, and at the request of the Secretary of War, the Assistant Secretary of War, the Director of Finance, and the Quartermaster General.

Mr. STERLING. As it is for work already done I shall make no objection. I thought it contemplated an appropriation for future work.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask unanimous consent that the vote of the Senate be reconsidered by which the amendment on page 29, beginning in line 24, down to and including line 2 on page 30, was rejected.

Mr. WARREN. I have no objection to that.

The motion to reconsider was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment, which will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. The committee reported, on page 29, line 24, to insert the following proviso:

Provided, That the sum of \$75,000, in addition to that now provided by law, shall be available for the compensation of necessary employees serving at the seat of government.

Mr. SMOOT. My President, I desire to say just a word in explanation of the reason for my request. The appropriation of \$75,000 proposed to be made by the amendment is for the employment of additional clerks in the District of Columbia. Officials of the Department of Justice came to my office this morning and stated that the money has already been spent. The appropriation for the detection and prosecution of crime for the present fiscal year amounted to \$2,600,000, and of that amount there was a limit of \$140,000 for the employment of clerks in the District of Columbia. This \$75,000 does not increase the appropriation, but it does allow the \$75,000 extra to be used for the hiring of clerks in the District of Columbia out of the original appropriation of \$2,600,000.

I am going to take occasion at this time to say, and I hope that the heads of the departments will take notice of it, that when Congress makes an appropriation for the employment of clerks in the District of Columbia or for any other specific purpose the departments must recognize the fact that that is the amount of money which is to be expended for the purpose named and for no other, and if there is to be a deficiency they ought to come to Congress before a deficiency is created. I know the heads of departments in the past have paid no attention to the amount appropriated, and that is why we have one, two, three, and four deficiency appropriation bills every year.

I hope that the departments will understand from now on that deficiencies must cease and that when we make an appropriation Congress means that the amount of money appropriated shall be expended for no other purpose than that named in the bill. I recognize from what was told me this morning by the officials of the Department of Justice that the money has already been expended, and the appropriation, of course, was made not for this purpose but for another purpose entirely.

I ask that the amendment be agreed to as submitted by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LODGE. I offer the following amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 22, after line 25, insert:

BUREAU OF CONSTRUCTION AND REPAIR.

For the preservation and completion of vessels on the stocks and in ordinary, etc., including the same objects specified under this head in the naval appropriation act for the fiscal year 1920, \$3,000,000.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, there are some economies which are more extravagant and wasteful than any form of expenditure, and this which I am trying to remedy is one. There are ships lying at all the yards in urgent need of repairs, some of them serious repairs and others repairs which will become serious if neglected. If these repairs are neglected and the ships are allowed to lie untouched, it will end in a necessary appropriation many times larger than the one now proposed.

I can speak from personal knowledge only of the yard at Boston, but the condition which exists there exists at all the yards. There are half a dozen ships there, two dreadnaughts, as I remember, absolutely in need of immediate repairs, and if this sum is not given it will be necessary to lay off, not the extra force caused by the war, but the men mostly of long service who were there in the prewar period; that is, to reduce the force of the yard below normal. It is always a bad and an expensive thing to break the organization of any great plant; and that would be another cause of expense.

This and several other similar appropriations were asked for very urgently by the department. I have introduced an amendment to cover only the Bureau of Construction and Repair. I have arbitrarily reduced in my amendment even the amount they requested from \$3,250,000 to \$3,000,000.

The official statements in regard to it will be found in the letter from the Secretary of the Navy sent in January 22, 1920, and the details in regard to it which I do not wish to take the time of the Senate to read. This is needed proportionally at all yards. The total sum is very small compared with the work that remains to be done.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. KING. I invite the Senator's attention to the naval appropriation act approved July 11, 1919. I find that the appropriation there is a little less than I had carried the figures in mind, but the Senator will remember that the naval appropriation act carried considerably more than \$400,000,000. I find on pages 20 and 21 of that act, under the head of "Bureau of Construction and Repair," that we appropriated \$31,000,000.

Mr. LODGE. I was aware of that.

Mr. KING. I had no doubt that the Senator was aware of it.

Mr. LODGE. I happen to be on the committee, I will say to the Senator, and I am not wholly ignorant about the subject, although not as wise as I should like to be.

Mr. KING. I am delighted that the Senator advises me of the fact that he is on the committee. I ask the Senator if the \$31,000,000 which was appropriated is not sufficient?

Mr. LODGE. It is not sufficient.

Mr. KING. The committee at that time, after full investigation, determined that \$31,000,000 was sufficient for the Bureau of Construction and Repair; and it seems to me that we ought not to be called upon at this time, particularly in view of the fact that we will soon have a general appropriation bill, to make a further appropriation.

Mr. LODGE. We cut the construction and repair item very low, as I thought, as we did all the appropriations. The fact is, to deal with the subject for a moment in a large way, we are in the same danger now that we were after the Civil War. The country then made up its mind that we were never going to fight again—that we never should need a Navy again—and the Navy was allowed to run down year by year until we practically had no Navy except a few old-fashioned wooden ships. By that treatment of the Navy after the Civil War, and the total neglect of it which followed for many years, the country was put to enormous expense to rebuild it when the inevitable rebuilding came.

There is no economy in it; on the contrary, as I have already said, it is worse than a wasteful expenditure to make economies of this character. Every day that those ships lie at the yards the bills for repairs increase, because a ship that is in that condition deteriorates very rapidly.

We ought to dismiss the idea that the Navy is not going to be a great expense to the country. It must be, because its defense and its safety lie in the Navy. Setting aside all the safety that is promised us in the league for the moment, I think grave dangers still exist, and that the country ought to be thoroughly protected on both oceans. To cut down the Navy as is proposed would leave us in a condition, to my mind, of extreme danger. I am not advocating extravagant appropriations at all; but the Navy, both in building and in personnel, must be kept up, and to that we must make up our minds. There are plenty of things that we can cut, and I have favored cutting, and that can wait, but the Navy must always be dealt with.

In this particular case I think it is extremely poor economy, as I have already said, to make this reduction. I do not know that there is anything more which can be said. The ships are there; they need repairs of all classes. There are two dreadnaughts, as I said before, in the Boston yard alone. They are scattered about at all the yards. I think you will find it the case in every yard in the country, that the ships are lying there; and the kind of cutting that is apparently being attempted elsewhere is reckless and not intelligent, to my mind. It is saving at the moment, only to add a great deal more at a

later day, just as we have dropped off a part of the railroad indebtedness. It makes a better appearance in the year's total appropriations. I see no economy in it whatever.

The way the thing comes about is the cutting of appropriation bills which ought to carry enough for the year. Then comes a deluge of deficiency bills, which is the most expensive way of legislating that there is. It arises from unwise reductions in the great bills which ought to carry, except for unforeseen emergencies, all the appropriations needed for the year.

The naval bill last year was cut too much, according to my idea, and that we should have a deficiency here and there does not surprise me. But I think that applies to all appropriation bills. We are all anxious to reduce the appropriations as much as we possibly can, and no one will do more in that direction than I.

In this particular case it is cutting off the most important service of the Government, for the Navy is more important to the Government than any other service. Owing to our isolation as a continent, it is the great bulwark of defense that we must always keep at the highest efficiency. It is the one place where there ought to be no serious reduction beyond the cutting off, of course, of the extraordinary war expenses, which will amount to hundreds of millions of dollars.

We ought to keep the Navy up. The first thing in keeping the Navy up is to keep the ships which we already have in repair. I know of no worse place to make a cut than in this particular direction. Thirty-one million dollars was appropriated. It was allotted among the bureaus as usual. They were called on to speed up in the summer for reasons given by the Secretary, and that led to a reduction of the allotment now. This is simply to keep them along for the present, and I think it is a very meritorious and a very important addition that ought to be made.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. President, I can not add to the larger aspects of the question that have been indicated by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], but it seems to me that it is a cheeseparing policy to allow the ships of the American Navy to lie rotting at the wharves for the want of a small appropriation to keep them in condition for use, if there is occasion to call upon them for use. I am perfectly certain that not only at the navy yard at Boston but on the Pacific coast and elsewhere the conditions are practically similar to those in my own State at the Philadelphia Navy Yard.

I do not look upon a ship myself as simply a mute and inanimate thing. It has a personality; it has a character; and these wounded veterans of the American Navy that are now at the various navy yards of the country are sentimentally entitled to be kept up and maintained.

It is false economy, Mr. President, to disorganize the personnel, to dissipate the organization at these great yards, because of the lack of an appropriation to carry on the work. In the Philadelphia yard I happen to know that the organization has been cut down to practically an American basis; that the 1,200 or 1,500 men who will be thrown out of employment if these ships are not to be taken care of and repaired are the cream of the large organization that it was necessary to maintain during the war in order to meet the demands made upon that yard. They have been substantially reduced to the men who own their homes in the vicinity of the yard. If we are going to be called upon to carry out a large naval program, it would not be many months after this organization had been dissipated before we would be compelled to call for a reorganization, and the private establishments of the country would have absorbed the highly intelligent artificers who have done this wonderful work.

So for the reason that it is a good factor of preparedness, that it is good sentiment, that it is good horse sense to put in the stitch in time which saves nine, I hope that the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts will prevail.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, of course I recognize that the Senator offering this amendment and those associated with him on the Committee on Naval Affairs have a greater knowledge of the subject as a whole than have I or the other members of the Appropriations Committee. I think, however, I will not say in defense but in the interest of the Senator offering the amendment and of the Committee on Appropriations, I ought in a few brief sentences to state the difficulties that might follow in arranging this legislation, so that the members of the Naval Committee may know what those difficulties are and may shape their debate accordingly.

The Secretary of the Navy requested of the House of Representatives some \$9,000,000. The House committee reported \$400,000 for certain purposes; in the House \$800,000 was put in; and \$9,000,000 was attempted to be provided, as a whole or in separate items. Several points of order were made at dif-

ferent times as to some of the items, and were sustained, and as to others they were overruled, and the question went to a vote of the House. The bill was before the House for some two weeks. The subject came up, as properly it should, early in the consideration of the bill. The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations there finally thought that he ought to refer the subject to the Committee on Naval Affairs of the House. I desire to read a few lines from the debate in the House merely to indicate what the difficulty was. The chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee of the House first stated that there was plenty of money; that there were \$21,000,000 unexpended; but he further said that he had taken the matter before his committee, that it had been considered there, and he said:

Here is the motion that was made and the one that was carried:  
*Resolved*, That it is the sense of this committee that the chairman of the committee inform the House that we think it wise to remove the limitation so as to authorize the appropriation—

It was sought to provide these amounts, first, instead of by direct appropriations, by transfer of appropriations previously made and then discontinued. However, the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] is an original proposition to appropriate the amount of money named, which, as he says, is less than the estimate. Of course, it is entirely in order. To finish the reading, the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs of the other House continued:

as recommended, of an additional expenditure of \$400,000 for technical help in the Bureau of Yards and Docks, and that it is further the sense of the committee that other appropriations sought by amendments that have been offered are not needed and will not be needed until after July 1, 1920, when they will be cared for in the regular appropriation bill.

And this resolution in the Naval Affairs Committee was agreed to, with but two votes opposing.

Of course, after that the Members who were interested in the various navy yards proceeded with the debate. I shall not quote anything further, but the debate is in the RECORD for Senators to see.

The chairman of the committee made some further observations which tended, of course, to block any amendment which might be offered and which will make it rather difficult, as will be observed, finally to enact this legislation, whatever we may do in the Senate. He made the claim that there were now, I think he said, 92 navy yards, which were twice as many as we needed, except during the war; and he stated that the commandants at those yards had exceeded their lawful authority, and after the Secretary had apportioned and allocated the money they went on and spent whatever they saw fit. He noted one navy yard, that at Newport News, to which the amount of money allocated was \$30,000 a month, and he stated that the commandant at that yard had spent \$88,000 a month, an excess of \$58,000 per month over the \$30,000 authorized to be spent. He went on further to state that dreadnoughts and other large vessels and all other warships could be repaired entirely and completely inside of the amount already appropriated and available, and that many of the "old tubs," as he termed them, and other craft that were not useful in war, and, in fact, that ought to be scrapped instead of repaired, could surely wait.

I submit the remarks of the chairman of the House committee without any prejudice on my part in order to show the condition with which the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate is confronted. While the committee did not report any of this legislation, I feel that if it is presented by members of the Committee on Naval Affairs they should know, and perhaps they have already read, what was said and done in the other House, and especially by Members of the House who are also members of the Naval Affairs Committee of that body.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has referred to the statement made by the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee of the House, in which he stated the department had plenty of money on hand for the work that must be done in taking care of the ships of the Navy. He stated, I think, that they had \$21,000,000 on hand. That statement was made on the 4th day of February, there remaining five months of the current year up to July 1. The total appropriation for the current year, as stated by Chairman BUTLER, for taking care of navy yards and for expenses necessary for taking care of ships, and so forth, was \$84,000,000, covering appropriations to the Bureaus of Yards and Docks, Steam Engineering, Supplies and Accounts, and Construction and Repair. Five months before the end of the current year \$63,000,000 of that \$84,000,000 had been spent, leaving only \$21,000,000 with which to take care of the other five months. The expenses during those five months are not estimated to be

lower proportionately than the expenses were during the first seven months.

The Navy Department, when it furnished its figures to the House committee, asked not for \$9,000,000, but for \$18,000,000. That sum was cut down by the Appropriations Committee of the House, and with the consent of the Naval Affairs Committee of the House, to, I think, \$9,300,000. That amount was in the bill which was passed by the House of Representatives last September. The Senate later turned that appropriation down when it came before them.

The amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], instead of asking for the \$18,000,000 originally asked for, or for the \$9,300,000 to which it had been cut down in September, merely asks for \$3,000,000 for the purpose of overhauling and taking care of the ships that are laid up in our navy yards. With that small appropriation it will not in any way be possible to take care of all of the ships which ought to be taken care of. Only a small amount of work can be done with it, but some of the work can be done with that amount of money.

I had a talk yesterday with Admiral Coontz, the Chief of the Bureau of Operations, and he told me that for every month the overhauling and repairing of a ship is postponed 5 per cent is lost; so that if the overhauling is postponed four more months, or from now until the 1st of July, 20 per cent will be lost; that is, if it would cost \$100,000 to overhaul a ship now, it will cost \$120,000 to overhaul the same ship four months from now.

As I have said, this small appropriation can not take care of all of the ships which must be taken care of, but it can provide for a certain amount of work. One of the things that it can do is to provide battleships which are now under repair, or which now should be under repair, for the annual cruise of the midshipmen of the Naval Academy. There are 1,800 of these midshipmen, and in making their annual cruises about 300 are placed on each vessel. If this money is appropriated it will enable the department to get ready six of the battleships which are now tied up in navy yards.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HALE. I yield.

Mr. LENROOT. Will not the Senator tell the Senate what was done with the \$60,000,000 that has already been expended this year for repairs, and why we are in a condition where we have not battleships enough to provide the annual cruise of the midshipmen after the expenditure of \$60,000,000 for repairs?

Mr. HALE. That money was used in the regular course of taking care of the ships and yards. We have 15 dreadnoughts in the Navy and 14 predreadnoughts. Of the 15 dreadnoughts, 12 are now in commission and cruising with the fleet, 3 are under repair. These 3 are all in Pacific waters. Of the 14 predreadnoughts which we have, only 1 is in commission, all of the others being under repair. It is estimated, as I have said, that with the \$3,000,000 proposed to be appropriated we can provide ships for the midshipmen, and we can do something in providing destroyers and tenders and hospital ships and other ships which are necessary to keep the fleet running.

It seems to me it is a very small amount of money which is asked for. We shall have to pay for the work directly, if we do not now get the \$3,000,000 for use in repairing ships. We will save \$600,000, on the basis of the figures I have already given, if the money is appropriated now, rather than allowed to go over until July. I believe the amendment is a reasonable one and I hope it will be carried.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield again I should like to ask whether, in his judgment, as a member of the Naval Affairs Committee, it should cost us more than \$80,000,000 to keep our Navy in repair?

Mr. HALE. The estimates, I believe, for the coming year have been cut down from \$84,000,000 to \$70,000,000, and as we get nearer and nearer a peace basis I presume they will be further cut down.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Maine to yield to me for a moment?

Mr. HALE. Certainly.

Mr. LODGE. I should like to have the Senator from Wisconsin state where he got the figures \$60,000,000 and \$80,000,000.

Mr. LENROOT. I got them from the Senator from Maine just a moment ago.

Mr. LODGE. The amount appropriated for the repair of ships was only \$31,000,000.

Mr. HALE. I was including all the various items for this purpose.

Mr. LODGE. The larger amount included engineering and maintenance.

Mr. HALE. I stated in my remarks that the estimate I gave included everything that was used in the Navy in connection with the taking care of the ships.

Mr. LODGE. That is the aggregate estimate for yards and docks and the estimate for engineering, and so forth. This item is only for repairs, and the appropriation for repairs was \$31,000,000.

Mr. HALE. The Senator was not in the Chamber, I think, at the time, but I stated in my remarks that the estimate that Mr. BUTLER made in his speech in the other House of \$84,000,000 covered all of those things.

Mr. KING. I gladly pay tribute to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] for his splendid service upon the Naval Affairs Committee, and I recognize his superior knowledge, growing out of his long service, as well as his great ability, with respect to matters connected with the Navy. I join with him in the statement that it is important that we should have a strong Navy. It has been the view of our statesmen in the past, and I am sure it will be in the future, that we shall have an efficient Navy, one that will protect the interests of our country. Some persons insist that we shall have the largest and strongest Navy in the world. Whether that view prevails or not, it is important that the future security of this Nation be assured, and it is obvious that under the conditions now prevailing in the world we can not do other than maintain an efficient Navy. I believe in a small standing Army and in a Navy that can defend this country against the assaults of any foe, but, Mr. President, the Senator's observations, as well as the statement made by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. KNOX], would convey the idea to a person not acquainted with the appropriations which have been made that we had been guilty of a "cheese-paring" policy in the last appropriation bill and during the past few years in dealing with the Navy.

I was in error a moment ago when I said that the last naval appropriation bill, passed in July last, carried between four hundred million and five hundred million dollars. I remember now that I made some observations at the time the Senate passed the bill, stating that, in my opinion, the bill ought to carry less than five hundred millions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920. It seems to me that in view of the tremendous burdens under which the Government was staggering, growing out of the war, and in view of the fact that we needed some little time to assemble the data which the war produced and learn the naval lessons which it taught, we could with safety to our country reduce the naval bill to approximately five hundred millions for the fiscal year. I find that we actually appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30 of this year \$616,096,838.88, and in addition to that we authorized contracts to be entered into aggregating \$64,463,000, so that, as a matter of fact, the appropriations made and authorized were nearly \$700,000,000. Senators can not say that we were guilty of "cheese-paring" when here was an appropriation of that prodigious sum for one year.

Senators will recall that only a few years back the appropriations for all departments of the Government were not much in excess of \$1,000,000,000, and now in peace times we appropriated nearly \$700,000,000 for the Navy alone. I do not think, Mr. President, that it can be truthfully said that Congress dealt in a niggardly way in the last appropriation bill with the Navy.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. President, does the Senator think that appropriations are now to be measured by the same yardstick that was applicable before the time the President kept us out of war?

Mr. KING. Oh, Mr. President, I do not think that the question submitted by the Senator necessarily called for the Senator to put a sting into it.

Mr. KNOX. Oh, no—

Mr. KING. And a thrust at the President of the United States, because he did keep us out of war with Mexico. The Senator could have asked his question without bringing in the President or the policy of the President.

Mr. KNOX. The conditions are essentially different now from what they were at the time to which the Senator refers, when the total expenses of the Government were in the neighborhood of \$1,000,000,000.

Mr. KING. Of course they are; I concede that; conditions are different; I concede that the appropriations for the Army and for the Navy and for the various departments of the Government may not be as they were in the halcyon days of the past. We have outgrown any sort of provincialism with which we might be charged and have become a world power; and we have not only become a world power but we will perforce be compelled to be "the" world power, not only materially but morally; we are going to lead the world, and because of our primacy we will be compelled, of course, to maintain a great

Navy and perform the duties and obligations that our exalted station demand. We can not, in the language of the scripture, "hide our light under a bushel." This Nation is as "a city set upon a hill," and its light will shine to illumine the world. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] referred to the League of Nations.

I am not going to be led into a discussion of the results which will follow the establishment of a union between the nations of the earth. Let me express the hope that a League of Nations will be established, one that will meet the aspirations of the lovers of peace and those who have faith in the future of humanity, and will remove from the backs of the laboring men of the world the burdens of taxation which will be imposed upon them by maintaining huge navies and great armies. But, Mr. President, I want to call attention briefly to some of the items in the naval bill passed in July, 1919, and I do it not by way of criticism but to repel the idea that the Senate has been niggardly in dealing with the Navy.

Inviting attention very briefly to the law providing appropriations for the current year, I find here an item for activities in the District connected with the Navy amounting to \$5,100,000. Aviation of the Navy, \$25,000,000.

Mr. LODGE. That was far too small.

Mr. KING. I pass by hurriedly many of the smaller items.

Bureau of Navigation, \$9,000,000.

Gunnery and engineering exercises, and so forth, \$350,000.

Outfits on first enlistment, \$9,000,000.

Supplies for seamen's quarters and for the purchase of other articles in the several navy yards, \$1,500,000.

Ocean and lake surveys, \$155,000.

Naval training station, California, \$225,000.

Naval training station, Rhode Island, \$350,000.

Naval training station, Great Lakes and maintenance of same, \$850,000.

Another naval training station at St. Helena and naval operating base, Hampton Roads, Va., \$310,000, including general care, repairs, improvements, and so forth.

Naval Reserve Force, \$50,000.

Receiving barracks, \$100,000.

Naval War College, Rhode Island, \$90,950.

Naval Home, Philadelphia, pay of employees, and so forth, \$144,000.

The next item carries a large sum—the Bureau of Ordnance. For that we appropriated \$25,000,000. That item cares for naval ammunition depots, torpedo stations, naval ordnance plants, maintenance of proving grounds, powder factories, torpedo stations, gun factories, ammunition depots, naval ordnance plants, maintenance and operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles to be used at ammunition depots, and so forth. As I stated, there is \$25,000,000 for that.

Purchase and manufacture of smokeless powder, \$2,500,000.

Naval gun factory at Washington D. C.: Improved machinery for existing shops, \$500,000.

Torpedoes and appliances: For the purchase and manufacture of torpedoes and appliances, to be available until June 30, 1922, \$1,000,000.

Torpedo station at Newport, R. I.: For labor and materials, general care of and repairs to grounds, buildings, and wharves, boats, and so forth, \$200,000.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President—

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. PHELAN. Do I understand that the Senator is reading the bill which is now embalmed in the law providing for expenditures for the fiscal year? And may I inquire if it is his purpose to criticize the items?

Mr. KING. It is not embalmed. It is a living, vital bill, and \$600,000,000 and more are taken out of the Treasury of the United States by reason of this very active and puissant thing which the Senator says is embalmed.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President, I only desire, for information, to know if the Senator is not reading from the statute—that is, the law which is in existence at the present time? I only desire to know if he is criticizing the items.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Ask him; do not ask me. [Laughter.]

Mr. HALE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. KING. I had yielded to the Senator from California.

Mr. PHELAN. I notice the discussion in the House under date of January 4, and I have in my hands, by the courtesy of the chairman of the committee in charge of the bill, a letter, dated February 14, from the Secretary of the Navy. We are debating

the amendment proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] providing for only \$3,000,000. The Secretary says:

I wish to call your attention to the inclosed copies of statements of Admiral Coontz, Chief of Naval Operations; of Admiral Griffin, Chief of the Bureau of Steam Engineering; and of Admiral Taylor, Chief of the Bureau of Construction and Repair, pointing out the military necessity for a deficiency appropriation of \$9,300,000.

I am writing you in the earnest hope that your committee will authorize these appropriations, so that the ships of the Navy, which cost many millions of dollars, may be cared for and that it will not be necessary for the Navy Department to discharge the skilled men who are needed at our navy yards for the repair of these ships.

During the war our navy yards were so busy with other craft that it was impossible to make the changes and repairs that are now absolutely necessary if the ships are to be kept in a military condition.

JOSEPH DANIELS,  
Secretary of the Navy.

He refers to Admiral Coontz, in charge of operations. The admiral says in his report:

The present unsettled conditions throughout the world demand that the ships of the Navy be kept in efficient condition for action, and the number of ships now capable of operating effectively in case of emergency is dangerously small.

And Admiral Griffin, in order to show the actual peril of the country in case of emergency, says in his report:

Even if appropriation requested—

That is, the \$9,000,000—

is granted it will not be possible to complete the repairs now in sight during the fiscal year. Much of the work must extend well into next year, and the vessels be unavailable for that period.

So, on the reports of our highest authorities, men interested only in the maintenance of the Navy as a perfect fighting machine, we are, it appears to me, under compulsion to adopt at least the amendment proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts or abandon the Navy and expose ourselves to emergencies. I will leave it to the Senator from Utah to say whether we are exposed to emergencies. The world is in an unsettled condition. We have not adopted any program for disarmament. We have not settled disputes among the nations; in fact, we are engaged in new disputes among the nations, and on the Pacific coast there is a matter of extreme emergency, to which I will call attention later—to-day or to-morrow—on account of the invasion of the western coast by aliens representing a warlike power. I can show, from expressions in their vernacular journals, their own home journals, a warlike spirit and hostility toward the United States. I say that under these conditions we can not, in justice to ourselves and to the country, in justice to the peace of the world and the safety of the Republic, weaken our first line of defense; and the authorities here on whom we must rely say that this appropriation is necessary.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, let me say to my good friend from California that perhaps the Secretary of the Navy and admirals may differ, and admirals may differ among themselves, as they did with respect to the Sims controversy. I do not know that they all agree with the attitude which is taken by the distinguished Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. PHELAN. That is in a field quite outside of the operation and maintenance of the Navy. It introduces a personal element, and these gentlemen are amenable to the weaknesses of human nature, which is the meanest thing about most of us.

Mr. KING. But the Senator must not attempt to put me in the attitude of being opposed to an adequate Navy. I have repeatedly said that I was in favor of an adequate and efficient Navy; that the situation which this country occupies upon the Western Hemisphere and its primacy in the world, demand that it shall have a great Navy.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SHEPPARD in the chair). Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. KING. Let me complete the sentence. The point I am trying to make, however, is that we did make a very large appropriation, nearly \$700,000,000, for one year for the Navy. That year will not expire until June 30 next. Out of that sum, obviously, there ought to have been sufficient to properly care for the ships that we have on hand; and let me say here, before I yield to my good friend, that I think it would be a most admirable thing if the Navy Department would dispose of a number of obsolete vessels of a type below the Utah standard. Senators will recall that Great Britain is disposing of many of the ships that have come through the war; they are obsolescent, out of date, inadequate for the strain which the future will put upon them. If we would get rid of some of our old craft and turn our attention toward the construction of vessels which the experience of the war has demonstrated to be necessary for our defense, I am inclined to think that the policy would be a wise one.

Mr. POINDEXTER and Mr. HALE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. KING. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. HALE. Will the Senator from Washington allow me to ask the Senator from Utah just one question?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Very well. I am compelled to leave the Chamber. That was the only purpose I had in asking the question at this time. I will, however, make the inquiry at some other time.

Mr. HALE. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. KING. I now yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. HALE. My purpose in rising was to say that we have substantially 960 ships of all kinds now in the Navy, and that it is proposed, when we reduce matters to a peace basis, to get rid of about 500 of those ships, and already an attempt is being made to do that.

Mr. KING. I was aware of that fact, and my only implied criticism was that we ought to act a little more promptly. I have the impression that it would have been economy if we had disposed of some of the smaller vessels, those not needed in the Navy, during the year 1919.

Mr. HALE. I agree with the Senator that it ought to be done as soon as possible.

Mr. KING. But, Mr. President, when the Senator from California spoke about an "embalmed bill" I was proceeding to read from a vital and living law.

We appropriated in this bill \$7,500,000 for the maintenance of the Bureau of Yards and Docks, and that includes many matters of repair.

For contingent expenses, Bureau of Yards and Docks, we appropriated \$150,000.

Then came public works, Bureau of Yards and Docks, hospital construction, and so forth, under which head we appropriated \$275,000, \$250,000, \$540,000, \$1,900,000—those items are for the navy yards at the various places, and their improvement—\$800,000, \$225,000, \$1,225,000, \$223,000; then follows an entire page of large appropriations relating to the navy yards and their repair, preservation, and improvement.

For the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery we appropriated \$7,500,000 and \$1,000,000, and for other purposes growing out of or cognate to that matter we appropriated \$1,700,000.

There was appropriated for the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, under the heading of "Pay of the Navy," \$164,203,000.

Provisions for the Navy, more than \$42,000,000.

Maintenance, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, \$15,500,000.

Freight, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, \$3,000,000.

Fuel and transportation, coal, and so forth, in connection with the Navy, \$12,000,000.

For the Bureau of Construction and Repair, including the repair of these vessels, we appropriated \$31,000,000.

Improvement of construction plants, \$200,000.

Bureau of Steam Engineering: For repairs, preservation, and renewal of machinery, auxiliary machinery, and boilers and naval vessels, yard craft, and ships' boats, and so forth, \$30,000,000.

I shall not take the time to call attention further to these pages of appropriations. I only challenged attention to them for the purpose of not permitting the impression to be deduced from this discussion that the Navy had not been adequately cared for in the last appropriation bill. It does seem to me that out of the nearly \$700,000,000, if there had been proper conservation, there would be an adequate amount to care for these vessels. It would seem from the representations which are made that the funds have been diverted for other purposes and that needed repairs upon these vessels have been neglected. That being true, it is quite likely that we ought to make this appropriation, but it would appear that those who have administered the law and handled this huge appropriation of nearly \$700,000,000 were delinquent in failing to properly care for the vessels needing repairs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE].

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll. The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ball	Fernald	Johnson, S. Dak.	McNary
Capper	Gay	Jones, Wash.	Moses
Chamberlain	Glass	Kellogg	Nelson
Colt	Gore	Kenyon	New
Culberson	Gronna	Keyes	Norris
Curtis	Hale	King	Nugent
Dial	Harris	Knox	Overman
Dillingham	Harrison	Lodge	Page
Edge	Henderson	McKellar	Phelan
Elkins	Hitchcock	McLean	Phipps

Pomerene  
Ransdell  
Robinson  
Sheppard

Simmons  
Smoot  
Spencer  
Sterling

Thomas  
Townsend  
Trammell  
Walsh, Mont.

Warren  
Watson  
Williams

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WOLCOTT], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK] are absent on public business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-five Senators having answered to their names, there is a quorum present. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE].

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on concurring in the amendments made as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I did not know the bill had been reported to the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is in the Senate. Will the Senator allow the question to be put on concurring in the amendments made as in Committee of the Whole?

Mr. KING. Very well.

The amendments were concurred in.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I rise for information, and should like to have the attention of the chairman of the committee. I invite the chairman's attention to the item on page 5, \$500,000 to enable the Interstate Commerce Commission to carry out the objects of the act of 1913. Was the appropriation which was made in the last appropriation act expended to continue its survey of the valuation of the railroads of the United States?

Mr. WARREN. It was provided, as the Senator knows, many years ago that there should be certain sums expended. A year ago, when this regular amount came to the committee, they cut it down. One or two of the commissioners came before the committee, explaining that there would soon be railroad legislation and that it was important to finish that work. I felt very much like grilling them quite extensively, and did so, as to the importance of the work and whether it was up to date, and whether, when they had surveyed something 10 years ago—some terminal or something of that kind—they were not far afield as to the value. I was assured by Mr. Prouty, who had it in charge, that they were keeping entirely up to date with it; and so we put back a portion of what we had left out. I dare say that is the cause of a deficiency.

Furthermore, as the Senator knows, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS], in charge of the railroad bill, has made almost constant and heavy and hard calls on the commission, and has needed this kind of a report on the work of which we are speaking.

Mr. KING. I was familiar, of course, with the bill and with the appropriation which was made when we had the general appropriation bill before us. It seemed to me that the amount carried was more than adequate for the current year, and I am astonished that a deficiency should be asked for at this time.

Mr. WARREN. Does the Senator wish me to understand that he thinks the commissioners, at the critical time when this railroad business was coming to a finish, should be unduly crippled in their work?

Mr. KING. Speaking for myself, of course, I think the act of 1913 under which the work is being done is an absurdity. It will be of no particular value. The attempt to value the railroads of the United States under an act passed in 1913, with their fluctuating values and changing conditions, will, in my opinion, prove unavailing. Already, where valuations have been made in certain particulars, they are contested in the courts, and any valuation that may be made by this commission or any other commission will not be a finality. The matter will go to the courts and the courts will have to pass upon the value of the railroads, whether they are taken over by the Government or not.

Mr. WARREN. I wish to assure the Senator, to comfort him in some degree, that I felt very much the same about the early valuation work, and on the committee in the earlier years I have opposed large appropriations, but I became convinced toward the end of it that, we having expended a very large amount of money, if we were to get any benefits whatever, it would come at the end, picking up the back work and bringing it up to date, which I believe they have done. I consider that the amount which has been expended lately has, of course, been of great importance.

Mr. KING. The work will cost at least \$22,000,000, and I do not know how much more, and when it is done, I repeat, it will be of but little value, because whenever the value of the railroads is called up into question, whether the Government is seeking to take over the property or otherwise, a judicial tribunal will be resorted to, and even if the findings of this commission

are given prima facie value they will not be conclusive and they will have but little weight before a court or jury.

I invite the Senator's attention to page 9, to the item of additional employees for the Coast Guard. I wish to say to the Senator that with respect to this matter members of the Coast Guard came to me some time ago and insisted that the personnel had been so depleted by resignations that the organization was unable to do its work. It would seem to me that having made provision in the general appropriation act for a certain permanent staff and a large part of that staff having resigned, if additional employees were brought into the service they would simply take the places made vacant by resignation. Can the Senator explain why this appropriation for additional employees is called for?

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I am going to reply to the Senator to the best of my knowledge, but I know he will be good enough to let me suggest to him that I wish he would consult the hearings when these matters are called up. I hold in my hand the evidence taken on the House side as to all these items.

Mr. KING. I will say to the Senator that I have examined that volume.

Mr. WARREN. I have also a volume of smaller size, containing evidence that was taken before the Senate committee, which the Senator has not examined.

Mr. KING. I have examined it, but not fully, because it is not humanly possible to become familiar with all the reports and testimony which the various committees submit.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator must have examined it in a very cursory manner, because it has not yet been printed in due form more than 48 hours. Of course, it is more or less tedious to take up these items, but I am very glad to answer the Senator.

As to the matter of the Coast Guard, as the Senator knows, there have been changes in that entire arm, and it has been consolidated with the Revenue-Cutter and Life-Saving Services. It appeared entirely natural on account of some losses that have been sustained that we should give them the help at this time which this item provides. The Senator will notice that it is only from February 1 to June 30 of the current year.

Mr. KING. I shall not move to strike out the item, but I am not at all satisfied with it. I think it is unwarranted. I also believe, Mr. President, that the appropriations found on page 10 of the bill, \$1,000,000 for pay and allowances, \$245,000 for rations or commutation, \$145,000 for fuel and water for vessels, and so on, and \$104,000 for outfits, and \$130,000 for traveling expenses, are improper in view of the fact that ample provision was made in the former appropriation bill, and further because in the bill which was passed the other day, and which I think was retroactive—I may be in error in that regard—the salaries of the officers of the Coast Guard were increased 31 per cent. If that was not retroactive, then, of course, my last criticism would not be well founded.

Mr. WARREN. The bill for that matter has not yet passed.

Mr. KING. Oh, no; but it probably will pass.

Mr. WARREN. I am informed that the House on the Navy part, which covers the items, absolutely refuses to consider the bill as we sent it to them.

Mr. KING. I should like to ask the Senator whether the item of \$1,000,000, lines 1 to 5, on page 10, is compensation in addition to that which was provided by law and which was carried in the last appropriation bill?

Mr. WARREN. Does the Senator understand that there are over 6,000 men regularly attached to the Coast Guard, and some 16,000 more have to be taken care of? Again, I say that we have to look out for the change that is taking place. The House did not allow by some \$600,000 what the department estimated and recommended, and the Senate committee did not raise what the House put up to us.

Mr. KING. It is very difficult to attack—

Mr. WARREN. It is a very expensive department, but as the Senator knows, it has been employed during the last years in the defense of the part of the Nation that had formerly been looked after by the larger craft. It is used now for life-saving and revenue-cutter purposes.

Mr. KING. There is one other item to which I wish to call the Senator's attention. It is on pages 34 to 36—\$500,000—under the head of "Lighthouse Service." Is that a deficiency, may I ask the Senator?

Mr. WARREN. Yes; it is.

Mr. KING. Were there any contingencies that arose which led to such a great deficiency?

Mr. WARREN. As I think the Senator knows, there has been more activity in the Lighthouse Service in the last two or three years than formerly, and we have added from time to time different lighthouses.

The matter of deficiencies, which the Senator, I hope, abhors as I do, and which formerly we were able to confine to close quarters, has gone away beyond all bounds during the war, and, of course, it is a laborious and painstaking process to get it back to a proper equilibrium, because a great many of the expenses that really are war expenses occur in getting well and getting over the war and getting things back into normal shape. For instance, we had a case a few moments ago where the Senate, by a large majority, voted for \$3,000,000 for the repair of ships in addition to what had already been given.

Mr. KING. There are a large number of items that are found in the bill which I think are wholly unwarranted.

Mr. WARREN. In the Lighthouse Service I notice by the hearing that there are some 6,000 persons employed.

Mr. KING. I am aware of that fact, and am aware of the splendid service rendered by the personnel in that agency of the Government. The only point I am making is that in the last appropriation act, as well as in the former one, very liberal amounts were carried, and it was assumed that with the increased personnel made necessary by conditions the appropriations were ample for the service. The point I am making is that in so many of these executive agencies of the Government, after committees have carefully gone over the estimates furnished by the departments and by the Government agencies, and Congress has made appropriations which it deemed adequate, or at least such as the Government was willing to expend, we are confronted within a short time by deficiencies, and still more deficiencies, and still additional deficiencies, right in the teeth of the statute which forbids the creation of these deficiencies. I admit that in some cases governmental agencies would cease to function if they did not create deficiencies, and perhaps the emergency may be at times so great as to warrant an infraction of the letter of the law if not the spirit of the law; but the persistence with which deficiencies are created, it seems to me, calls for some strong action by Congress and now and then a rejection of the demands which are made for appropriations to meet expenditures which have been incurred by officials of the Government in violation of law.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Utah that the appropriations for the current year which were asked and recommended by this department totaled \$4,000,000. The appropriations provided amounted to \$3,500,000; and there have been, as I have stated, some necessary additional expenditures. In this case they asked for \$800,000, and the House cut it to the amount set forth in the bill. The members of the Senate committee carefully considered every item of this bill; they examined the statements made before the House committee, as well as examining witnesses themselves; and the committee can see no reason at the present time for cutting down the amount which the House has provided in the bill. I hope the Senator's remarks along this line and others which he so ably submits will be carefully read by those who are Members of the House as well as listened to by Members of the Senate, for I should like all to be fully imbued with the growing feeling in the Senate that the way to cut down expenses is to cut them down.

I think the Senator from Utah knows that the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and his committee are engaged in the very work of cutting, as is evidenced by the pending bill. When we brought the bill to the Senate it contained nearly \$3,000,000 less than the amount provided by the other House, which amount had been arrived at after the closest kind of scrutiny, and after the House leader and many other Members managed to get declarations in the press from day to day as to how much they were going to save and what they were going to do, and with the two parties over there vying meanwhile with each other in their proclamations of intended economy and making speeches of all kinds in favor of economy. The House committee decided it had cut to the very bottom in the bill which the House sent over to us.

Since the bill came to us from the House it has been very much in the position of one running the gantlet of the Indians. The man might live to get to the end, but he would be badly disfigured. I repeat, we have made a cut of nearly \$3,000,000 in the House bill.

Of course, as chairman of the committee, I am powerless, and the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations in the other House is powerless—when the committees have reported bills containing appropriations to the respective Houses—to prevent Representatives and Senators from proposing and the two bodies from adopting amendments.

So in this matter, since the Senator from Utah does not offer any amendment and probably does not intend to offer one and should not, I am glad to have a full expression from him. I hope

his views in favor of economy and the cutting of expenses are sympathized with by Senators on the other side of the aisle, as I know they are sympathized with by those on this side of the aisle.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I do not wish my friend from Wyoming to think that any criticism in which I have indulged is intended as a reflection upon the Appropriations Committee. I think the work that committee has done upon the pending bill entitles it to the commendation of the Senate and of the country. I think the chairman of the committee has performed valuable service and has done what he could to promote economy in the administration of the affairs of the Government. I am sure that he will find upon this side of the aisle a determination to reduce the expenses of the Government and to relieve the taxpayers of the country of the burdens pressing upon them. Indeed, I want to state to the Senator that if the Republican side does not practice greater economy than it is doing, there will be many criticisms from this side of the Chamber, as well as from the country, and earnest efforts to place the affairs of the Government upon a sound and economical basis.

With all of our cutting we have got to do more cutting, and with all of our economy there has got to be more Spartan economy, or else we shall be compelled to increase the taxes or resort to a bond issue. With our decreasing imports and our decreasing exports, and with the slowing down of business which inevitably will result, there will not be the volume of taxes flowing into the Treasury that we have beheld during the past three years. With a lean Treasury and with constant demands made upon it, I am sure we shall have to seek other sources of taxation or resort to bond issues. We must do neither. We ought to reduce the taxes in every way possible, and, of course, we ought to reduce the expenses in every possible way.

Mr. President, before resuming my seat I wish to call attention to the fact that on yesterday during the discussion with respect to the appropriation made with respect to the enforcement of the prohibition law and the laws passed under the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution, my colleague [Mr. Smoot] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Warren] made certain statements as to the large sum which would be required to enforce the law. My good friend from Wyoming said that he thought it would cost \$50,000,000 annually to enforce the prohibition law. I stated that, in my opinion, it would be a scandal and an outrage to appropriate the sums mentioned by the Senator and by my colleague [Mr. Smoot] for the enforcement of that law; that a system of espionage would be established which would be resented by the American people. I think the statements made by my distinguished friends, however, as to the amount asked by the Treasury Department and the officials of the Government for the enforcement of the law were not quite accurate.

The facts are, Mr. President, that the Treasury Department made an estimate of \$4,000,000 for the enforcement of the national prohibition law by the Internal Revenue Bureau for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921. It made an estimate of \$750,000 to enforce the act of December 17, 1914, governing the sale of opium, and so forth. That estimate is the same as the amount provided by Congress for the enforcement of that act during the present fiscal year. These estimates total \$4,750,000.

The legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill reported to the House February 18, 1920, provides a combined appropriation of \$4,500,000 for the enforcement of both acts.

Mr. President, I feel that in justice to the Treasury Department and to the officials of the Internal Revenue Service this statement should be made, so that it may not go to the country, unchallenged that there has been so large an amount as that stated yesterday demanded for the enforcement of existing statutes relating to Federal prohibition. I feel sure that the Secretary of the Treasury will exercise a vigilant care over the officials of the Internal Revenue Service, and that the officials in that service will, while administering the law faithfully and well, practice the most rigid economy.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Utah that in connection with the larger figures which I gave I did not say that that amount had been demanded. I gave it as my prognostication of what it would cost. I did not refer, nor did the senior Senator from Utah, to the cost to the United States Treasury of the revenue which we lost, \$700,000,000 or \$800,000,000 per annum, obtained through the taxation upon liquors.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I do not know that I understand the last observation of the Senator from Wyoming, but our discussion did not relate to the loss to the Treasury of internal-revenue taxes derived from the manufacture and sale of intoxi-

ating liquors. The discussion related only to the cost of enforcing the prohibition laws enacted by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. WARREN. I gave the high figure, which I hope the Senator from Utah and others, with me, will be able to prevent being reached, as the maximum, but I think it will be larger still when we come to reckon, which we did not mention yesterday, the loss of revenue. However, it may be worth all that it costs. I will say to the Senator, if it thoroughly succeeds in putting an end to the curse of drunkenness caused by the thousands of bars and common saloons with which our country has been burdened. I wish for an absolute cure, and quickly; but I want the Congress and the public to know that it is no child's play in which the Republic is engaged in its effort to stamp out the long-standing alcoholic vice.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota in the chair). The question is, Shall the amendments be engrossed and the bill read a third time?

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. WARREN. I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary be authorized to correct all totals in the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### CALLING OF THE ROLL.

Mr. KENYON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum having been suggested, the Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Glass	Lenroot	Sheppard
Ball	Gore	Lodge	Shields
Borah	Gronna	McKellar	Simmons
Brandegee	Hale	McNary	Smith, Ga.
Chamberlain	Harris	Moses	Smoot
Colt	Harrison	Myers	Spencer
Culberson	Henderson	New	Sterling
Dial	Johnson, S. Dak.	Norris	Thomas
Dillingham	Jones, Wash.	Overman	Trammell
Elkins	Kellogg	Page	Warren
Fernald	Kenyon	Phelan	Watson
Frelinghuysen	Keyes	Ransdell	Williams
Gay	Knox	Robinson	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-one Senators having answered to the roll call, a quorum is present.

#### TREATY OF PEACE WITH GERMANY.

Mr. LODGE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business in public executive session for the purpose of considering the German treaty.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the treaty of peace with Germany.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask leave to have printed in the RECORD—I will not read it—a very interesting statement from Lord Bryce which appears in the Manchester Guardian. It is in regard to the condition of Europe to-day. Lord Bryce is one of the strongest supporters of the league that I know, but he makes no reference whatever to the league as a solution of the difficulty.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT EUROPE IS TO-DAY—DISAPPOINTMENTS AT THE PEACE CONFERENCE—AMERICA'S SEEMING INDIFFERENCE DUE TO LACK OF KNOWLEDGE AND NOT OF GOOD WILL.

(Lord Bryce in the Manchester Guardian.)

"Few people in Great Britain realize what is the present situation in continental Europe—how unforeseen and how menacing. This is much more the case as regards the people of the United States. Its people, too, are occupied with urgent domestic questions, some of them novel, many of them perplexing and disquieting. They have little time to spare for studying Old World questions. The information, moreover, which their press, alert and ably conducted as it is, supplies to them about what is passing in Europe and the Near East is not sufficiently full and exact to enable them to grasp the present situation in all its intricacies. "What is that situation?"

"During the years from 1914 to 1919 nearly everyone expected that the tempests of war would be followed by a season of fair weather. The exhausted peoples to whom repose at last had come would turn gladly back to the pursuits of peace. The conference of the allied and associated powers would set itself in a high and impartial spirit, sobered by the terrible crises through which we have been passing, to remove the causes which had brought about the catastrophe of 1914, to soften down national animosities, to enable the nations to make a fresh start on better

lines of thought and feeling than those which had prevailed before and had brought disaster with them. \* \* \*

"Many allowances must be made for the embarrassments which beset the conference, for the discordance of views, for the atmosphere of revengeful passion in the midst of which they had to work, for the incessant interferences by a press whose wires were liable to be pulled by all kinds of interests, for the complexity of most of the problems presented for solution. There was nothing in history sufficiently resembling the situation of 1918 to warn the conference against some at least of the rocks and shoals through which their course lay.

"But, whatever allowance must be made, it is plain—hardly any well-informed man now doubts it—that the conference has failed to solve the problems presented to it. I write not to criticize, but to set forth the facts as they now stand. The prospect of future peace and a restoration of normal conditions is dark. There are no elements of stability in the settlement. Things are in many respects worse than they were before the war. New causes of strife have in many places been added to those which previously existed; and it is not to the war only, but the action of the conference also, that this is due. The re-distributions of territory have in some instances glaringly disregarded the principles of nationality and self-determination. New 'irredentas' are being created. The provisions made for the protection of minorities are of doubtful efficacy and have been reluctantly accepted by some States. The authority of the conference has more than once been openly flouted. The indemnities and reparations to be exacted from the defeated powers go beyond the terms of the armistice and are such as they can not possibly discharge under the conditions imposed. The Allied Powers have overreached themselves and would get more if they had insisted upon less.

"We in Britain are only beginning to realize what all these things mean and how deeply our own welfare is involved. Need we, then, be surprised that the American people have not yet been awakened to the facts of the position?"

"How the imminent perils which we see are to be faced is a large question which I do not venture even to approach. That is beyond my present purpose, which is only to repeat that Englishmen must not hastily assume that America is indifferent in this crisis. The people of the United States are only now beginning to be reminded by some of their wisest and most respected men of what has only recently dawned upon ourselves. Let Englishmen who have thought America cold or unsympathetic understand that it is not want of sympathy but want of knowledge that is answerable for their apparent aloofness. Some things familiar to us are unknown to them. They do not, for instance, understand how there comes to be in some quarters a strange recrudescence of tenderness for the unspeakable and irreclaimable Turk. They have not grasped the fact that the 'Irish question' is no longer one between Great Britain and Ireland, but between sections of the Irish people in Ireland itself.

"The new world is still a long way off the old world. The picture of Europe as we see it to-day is veiled from Americans by the mists of the Atlantic. As it took many months in 1914 and 1915 to make the causes of the war plain to those who dwell beyond the Alleghenies, was it to be expected that the condition in which the war has left Europe should be immediately realized so far away? No one who has known America for half a century, or indeed for a far shorter time, will ever doubt American idealism and American sympathy."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending amendment is what is known as the amendment to reservation No. 1, offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE].

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, the amendment is printed, of course, and all Senators understand that the purpose of the amendment is to give Congress the right alone to give notice of withdrawal, and the same right is formally conferred upon the President by the amendment. I have already explained it to the Senate at some length, and I have no desire to go into it further.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. BORAH. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, before the vote is taken I want to say a few words on a subject which, it seems to me, should be made plain at this time.

I had supposed that the Democratic attitude on the treaty and its ratification had been pretty well established and that Senators on this side of the aisle had demonstrated conclusively their attitude. From the very first every effort has been made on this side of the aisle to promote ratification and secure it at the earliest date. Going back over the discussions of the

last session, I call attention to the fact that the time of the Senate was consumed chiefly by those opposed to ratification, and the supporters of the treaty consumed something less than 27 per cent of the time, as I remember the actual figures.

Coming down to the date in November when the votes were finally taken upon the resolution of ratification, I call attention to the fact that the Democratic Senators, finding that ratification without reservations had become impossible, yielded that point and offered reservations of an interpretative character, and when those were rejected the position on this side of the aisle was such that we asked for time within which it might be possible to secure a compromise of the differences. When the motion was made to reconsider the vote by which ratification had been rejected we supported the motion to reconsider. When, then, a motion was made to lay upon the table this effort at reconsideration we voted against the motion to lay upon the table, and it was laid upon the table by the votes of Senators on the other side of the aisle against our protest, and when Senators on the other side of the aisle stated that the treaty by that vote was dead and placed in its coffin here in the Senate we declared that it was not dead. It was from this side of the Chamber that action was taken for the purpose of bringing the treaty again before the Senate for consideration. It was on this side of the Chamber that the initiative occurred for creating the bipartisan conference, in order that compromise might be considered with a view to ultimate agreement; and when that bipartisan conference met it was from the Democratic side—always from the Democratic side—that offers of compromise were made, and it was from the other side that rejections always came.

Finally, when the bipartisan conference broke up because of the unyielding disposition on the Republican side, it was from the Democratic side of the Chamber that notice was given that we proposed on the 10th of February to call up the treaty for reconsideration. When that action had been taken by us the forced action was then taken by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], who then stated, on February 2, that he would call up the treaty on February 9, and we concurred in his effort. We gave unanimous consent to his action, and the treaty was brought before the Senate again with our full concurrence and support.

Yet, Mr. President, notwithstanding this attitude on the part of the Senators on this side of the aisle, I find published in a Washington paper this week an article which reads in part as follows:

Some of the Republican friends of the peace treaty with Germany in the Senate to-day expressed the opinion that Senator HITCHCOCK, the administration leader, and probably the President, are bent on forcing the treaty into the campaign.

One of these Senators said the Democrats find themselves on the defensive without an issue in the coming campaign.

"I can not help feeling," he said, "that the administration leader has reached the conclusion the controversy over the peace treaty will perhaps give the party a fighting chance for victory next November if it becomes an issue."

Mr. President, we are not afraid of the issue in the campaign, but we do not propose to be placed in the attitude of preventing or delaying ratification of this treaty if it can be brought about. The country demands ratification, and it demands that Senators yield to each other in order to effect a compromise and bring about ratification. We are ready. We have gone more than half the way, Mr. President—far more than half the way. Forty Senators upon this side of the Chamber have authorized me to present to the Senators upon the other side of the Chamber alternative propositions of compromise—not a single proposition, but alternative propositions. We have invited you to choose one of those and present it to us, and we have guaranteed to accept it—a compromise on article 10, which is the only serious difference between us at the present time that seems insuperable. We are ready to take either one. One was the reservation framed and formulated in the bipartisan conference, composed of Republican and Democratic Senators, the joint handiwork of Republican and Democratic Senators, almost agreed to. We are willing to take that. In substance and in language it is very similar to the Lodge reservation on article 10. We are willing to take it.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DIAL in the chair). Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield.

Mr. BORAH. What is the difference between the bipartisan reservation and the Lodge reservation? What is the difference in principle?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I hope the Senator will not insist just now upon diverting me. I am willing to answer the question a little later.

We are willing to take that reservation. We are willing also as an alternative, if that is not acceptable to Senators on the other side, to take the reservation on the same subject proposed by former President Taft, a Republican leader with a great Republican following and a great independent following in the United States to-day.

I ask to have the two proposed reservations to which I have referred printed in the RECORD in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### BIPARTISAN CONFERENCE RESERVATION.

"The United States assumes no obligation to employ its military or naval forces or the economic boycott to preserve the territorial integrity or political independence of any other country under the provisions of article 10, or to employ the military or naval forces of the United States under any other article of the treaty for any purpose, unless in any particular case the Congress, which under the Constitution has the sole power to declare war, shall by act or joint resolution so provide. Nothing herein shall be deemed to impair the obligation in article 16 concerning the economic boycott."

#### MR. TAFT'S SUGGESTED RESERVATION.

"The United States declines to assume any legal or binding obligation to preserve the territorial integrity or political independence of any other country under the provisions of article 10, or to employ the military or naval forces of the United States under any article of the treaty for any purpose; but the Congress, which under the Constitution has the sole power in the premises, will consider and decide what moral obligation, if any, under the circumstances of any particular case, when it arises, should move the United States, in the interest of world peace and justice, to take action therein, and will provide accordingly."

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, those are the two propositions on article 10 that we present to you. The only criticism that has been uttered upon those propositions from the other side of the aisle since they were presented is that both of them are so close to the Lodge reservation that it is unreasonable for us not to take the Lodge reservation. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER], in his speech the other day supporting the present Republican attitude and criticizing the Democratic attitude, made this statement:

I defy any Senator to point out to me any substantial difference between the so-called Lodge reservation to article 10 and the so-called Taft reservation to article 10. There is no difference whatever in legal effect between these two, which the Democratic Members say they are willing to support; and they say they are willing to support either one of two which they propose and the Lodge reservation.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. If the only criticism that can be offered to our tender of compromise is that we have made a tender which so closely corresponds to the Lodge reservation that to most Senators there is no difference between them, is it not complete proof that we have done all that we possibly can on this side of the Chamber to bring about ratification?

Mr. LENROOT. Will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Yes.

Mr. LENROOT. Does the Senator from Nebraska agree with the statement of the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Not fully.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the Senator explain wherein they differ?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I will say to the Senator, however, that neither of these propositions for compromise which we have submitted is agreeable to me. I do not like either reservation, either the one presented by ex-President Taft or the one formulated in the bipartisan conference. They are both obnoxious to me. I could only accept either under the most severe tension in order to bring about a compromise. Either one involves a great sacrifice to me, and I am sure to other Senators upon this side of the Chamber. But when we have gone so far as to present two alternative propositions which your own Members declare so closely resemble the Lodge reservation that they can hardly be detected from the Lodge reservation, we certainly at least are not open to the charge that we are attempting to bring the treaty into the next campaign as an issue between the parties. On the other hand, we have gone nine-tenths of the way toward meeting the public demand for a compromise and a settlement; and it is on the other side of the aisle that the responsibility exists for refusal to go the one-tenth of the way necessary to bring about a compromise.

Mr. KELLOGG and Mr. BORAH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. KELLOGG. Will the Senator please give us his view of the difference between the two reservations proposed by the Senator and the Lodge reservation?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I observe a great curiosity on the other side of the aisle to get me to analyze these propositions, and I am not disposed to yield to it. Senators on the other side of the aisle need no guardian and no assistance. We here on this side have united, 40 Senators strong, and have presented to you an offer of compromise which you admit is nine-tenths the same as the Lodge reservation.

Mr. LODGE. Nobody has admitted that.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator from North Dakota admitted it.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator from North Dakota may, but—

Mr. HITCHCOCK. And other Senators who have spoken to me have declared that if we could take those two compromises, we could take the Lodge reservation.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. BORAH. Do I understand, then, from the Senator from Nebraska that this is the only compromise that the Senator will accept and that he will go no further?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I think that question is hardly a considerate one to come from a Senator who does not go at all, and who never offers to compromise in the slightest degree; and I want to say right here—

Mr. BORAH. I want to be fair with the Senator. I am trying, as an onlooker in Vienna as between reservationists, to find out really where the difference is, in order that I may be guided in my conduct in the future with reference to this matter. I do not know what the views of the Senator are with reference to the two reservations as distinguishing them from the Lodge reservation. I do not know whether his view is that there is a chimerical difference or a substantial difference, whether it is a question of principle or a mere question of language. I should really like to know, as a Senator, whether or not the Senator believes that there is a substantial difference, a difference in principle, inhering between the two propositions.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I appreciate the Senator's curiosity as to my beliefs, but I think they are like "the flowers that bloom in the spring"; they have nothing to do with the case.

The situation is this: The Senate is in deadlock over the treaty ratification, and it has been in deadlock for months, and there is a widespread public demand to have a settlement, and that demand is for a compromise. Forty Senators on this side of the aisle have declared their willingness to go nine-tenths of the way toward securing a compromise. On the other side of the aisle the attitude is that the very Senators who have criticized the President of the United States and charged that he had brought to the Senate a treaty which he had negotiated and had taken the unreasonable position, as they declared, that he would not consent to the dotting of an "i" not to the crossing of a "t," stand here now, 49 strong, refusing in the all-important case of this reservation on article 10 to dot an "i" or to cross a "t." They defy the public opinion of the United States, which demands a settlement, and they assert that there will not be one iota of change in this all-important reservation.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I want the country to understand that on this side of the aisle there is no disposition to make this great subject a football of politics, but that we will go to all lengths, even to the sacrifice of our preferences and the sacrifice of our opinions, toward working out a compromise. When we have offered that compromise, as we have in an alternative form, one of the forms written by the former President of the United States and a great Republican leader to-day, and the other one formulated by the bipartisan conference of Senators, we have done our duty at least, and we have presented to you the question whether you propose to meet the public demand and get the treaty ratified. We are not in a position to be charged with an effort to bring this matter into the political campaign that is now impending. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. LENROOT. Does the Senator from Nebraska take the position that the construction of the proposition which he presents to the Senate is of no importance to the Senate or the country? He has presented a proposition here of which he himself is unwilling to give his construction.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It is not necessary that I should analyze for Senators on the other side of the aisle these two propositions. They have generally in the past been able to get along without my advice. I will not be diverted from the issue. The

issue is whether you on that side of the aisle propose to adhere to your proposition that you will not make any offer of compromise and that you will spurn every offer of compromise that we make, even when we go nine-tenths of the way. If you are willing to do it, all right, we will accept it; but I object to having this side held responsible if the treaty is brought into politics.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield.

Mr. KELLOGG. I ask the Senator if it is not true that the Republican leader, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], has proposed sundry changes in various reservations?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Yes; that is very true, and I will instance one of them. The first one is now before the Senate. The change will hardly be denominated by anyone a compromise. It is more obnoxious than the original provision. The original provision was that the United States could withdraw from the league by means of a concurrent resolution. That was the original provision, and many Senators voted for it under the delusion that a concurrent resolution might possibly be adopted by Congress and that the President might be entirely ignored in the matter; but when Senators looked up the matter and found that the concurrent resolution would probably have to go through the White House and receive the consideration of the President they changed their course; and now they have brought in an amendment providing that the Congress alone, by a majority vote of each House, or the President, may withdraw from the league. In other words, they have now provided in this amendment so that it will require the constant concurrence of the President and the Congress in order to keep the United States in the league, and if either branch of the Government should decide to go out of the league that action could be taken by that branch, and we might have a quarrel between the two branches of the Government as to whether we would stay in or go out of the league.

Is that a compromise, Mr. President? That is only making matters worse than they were before, and it is nothing in the nature of a compromise.

Mr. KELLOGG. Is that the only compromise which was offered by the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It was not a compromise at all. I would hardly say it was. I do not care to quibble with the Senator over what was offered. I will say that as an instance of what we get as a result of that effort at a bipartisan conference is to bring in as the very first amendment a much more obnoxious provision than was in it before, and it is a provision which is going to throw the league question into the very next campaign if we now ratify the treaty.

Suppose we ratify the treaty? Suppose we ratify it by some compromise and include this proposed amendment by the Senator from Massachusetts, allowing either the President or the Congress to take us out of the league upon giving two years' notice. Is it the plan to elect a President of the United States who will do that thing, and thus achieve the ratification of the treaty and our withdrawal from the league? Is it the plan to throw the issue into the next presidential campaign as to the personality of the candidate to be elected? It may be or it may not be, I do not know, but it looks at least as though that might be; but certainly it is an obnoxious change even in the already objectionable Lodge reservation, because it provides for a division of the Government of the United States.

The Government of the United States does not consist of the Executive alone nor of the legislative branch alone, and all solemn acts attaining great importance should have the concurrence of the Executive and the legislative branch. Neither the Congress alone nor the President alone should have the power to take the United States out of the League of Nations after this great struggle to enter it. It will be a solemn enough matter to decide whether we shall go out to have it passed upon by the Congress and the President, and not by either one alone.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield.

Mr. KELLOGG. Is it not a fact that under the original reservation that was adopted by the Senate in November the President alone could withdraw the United States from the league?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I think not.

Mr. KELLOGG. I think the Senator is mistaken. Is it not a fact—

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I think not, but that reservation we voted against. That reservation we did not approve. In our opinion it should require a joint resolution to take the United States out of the league, a resolution passed by a majority of each

House and approved by the President of the United States. That is the sort of a notice which we think should be given. That is the sort of a notice which unites the Government of the United States and expresses the will of the American people beyond any qualification.

Mr. President, I had not intended this afternoon to say anything more, but I ask to have inserted in the RECORD an Associated Press telegram from Chicago showing that the National League of Women Voters, which has recently held its great convention in Chicago, adopted a resolution demanding the immediate ratification of the treaty, and that they defeated a provision to include the support of reservations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

WOMEN FAVOR LEAGUE—PASS RESOLUTION WITHOUT CLAUSE CALLING FOR RESERVATIONS—OPPOSE MILITARY TRAINING—MAUD WOOD PARK, OF BOSTON, ELECTED HEAD OF NEW SUFFRAGE ORGANIZATION—AMERICA WARNED OF ILL-CONSIDERED ATTEMPTS TO MEET PROBLEMS OF RADICALS.

CHICAGO, February 18.

The National League of Women Voters, after adopting a resolution opposing universal compulsory military training, refused at the closing session to-day to reconsider its action. The motion to reconsider was defeated, following spirited argument.

A resolution indorsing the League of Nations was passed after a clause calling for reservations had been stricken out. The resolution reads:

"Resolved, That we urge adhesion of the United States to the League of Nations with the least possible delay."

The next national meeting of the league will be called by the board of directors. The league succeeds the National American Woman Suffrage Association, which dissolved after fighting for woman's right to suffrage since 1839.

#### CHAMPIONS OF FREE SPEECH.

At to-day's session rights of free speech, free press, and free representation were emphatically supported. The women declared their opposition to any attempts to use violence against the Government, but warned that "ill-considered attempts to meet this difficulty" imperiled the real liberty of American citizens.

Proper provisions for education and for increases in the pay of teachers were urged.

Maud Wood Park, of Boston, heads the league, according to the result of an election by the board of directors of its officers, who are also the officers of the whole organization. Mrs. George Cellhorn, of St. Louis, is vice chairman; Mrs. Richard Edwards, of Peru, Ind., treasurer; and Mrs. Solon Jacobs, Birmingham, Ala., secretary.

The league sent a telegram to the women of Washington State encouraging them in the fight for ratification by that State of the nineteenth constitutional amendment.

#### FEAR "PRUSSIANIZING EFFECT."

A school for women voters, to continue a week, will open to-morrow. Opponents of universal military training declared it would have a "Prussianizing effect" on the country, and urged the need of strict economy in governmental expenditures. Dr. Ethel Hurd, of Minneapolis, advocated adequate military preparation.

Mrs. Fletcher Dobyns, of Chicago, who led the fight for military training, said that such a system was necessary to insure the safety of the Nation.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I also present for reference to the Committee on Foreign Relations a resolution adopted by the Men's Club of St. Pauls and St. James Methodist Episcopal Churches of Niagara Falls, signed by about 100 members, demanding the immediate ratification of the treaty without reservations; also a similar resolution adopted by the Ministers' Association of Albion, Ill., for a similar purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolutions will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, the important thing is the action that the Senate shall take in the immediate future regarding this treaty. Past history perhaps is not very important, but there are some statements made by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] that should not go unchallenged, particularly the statement he made that throughout the months of debate there was a spirit of compromise on the part of the Democrats but none on the part of the Republicans. The fact is, as the Senator well knows, that he himself, up to the very moment when the vote was taken, prior to the adjournment in November, refused to consider any proposition of compromise. He was repeatedly approached during the early portion of the controversy as to whether he would consider reservations, and he declined to do so.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I hope the Senator will not put me in that attitude.

Mr. LENROOT. That is the truth.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. No; it is not an accurate statement. I know what my position was. I, of course, talked with many Senators. I am charged with the responsibility of leadership on this side on this question. I declined to consider the subject of reservations until we got through with the subject of amendments. I said, "We will cross that bridge when we come to it." That is all I told anyone. I used that language repeatedly not only to Senators but to newspaper correspondents.

Mr. LENROOT. That is true.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. We saw what was coming. We realized that reservations were inevitable, but we declined to involve them in the fight that we were making to defeat all amendments to the treaty.

Mr. LENROOT. That is true. It merely confirms the statement I made that the Senator's language always was, when he was approached with reference to compromise, that he would cross that bridge when he came to it. But that bridge did not appear to the Senator from Nebraska until the final vote upon the treaty that laid upon the table the motion to reconsider. He was invited to present a proposition after all amendments had been disposed of, before the final vote was had upon the treaty, and he refused to do it.

One step further. The Senator from Nebraska states that this matter has been reopened, and the bipartisan conference was held upon the initiative of the Democrats and not upon the part of the Republicans. I do not charge the Senator from Nebraska with stating that which he knows to be false, for he probably was not aware of the fact that the initiative taken by the bipartisan conference came from the Republican side of the aisle and not from the Democratic side, and it came because while it was well known to the Senator from Nebraska and to the country that the Republican side of the aisle could not consider any change in the substance of the reservation to article 10, nevertheless many, many Democrats came to the Republicans here informally and suggested that the matter be reopened for further consideration; and they knew that the Republicans could not and would not change the substance of the reservation upon article 10. It was upon the suggestion of Republicans that the bipartisan conference was held, although the Senator from Nebraska may not know it.

We might as well be entirely frank about it, Mr. President; the fact is that there are enough Democrats upon the other side of the aisle who, if they will cut loose from the leading strings of the President of the United States, will be in sufficient number to secure the ratification of the treaty.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President—

Mr. LENROOT. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Until now I had some kind of an idea that I myself was entitled to whatever credit there may be in the suggestion of a bipartisan conference. It may be that it originated upon the other side of the aisle; I can not speak about that; but long before it assembled I myself suggested it to a number of Senators upon the other side of the aisle. It may be that I did not originate it, but I certainly had as much part in the origination as anyone on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin tolerate an interruption?

Mr. LENROOT. Certainly.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I wish to call his attention to the fact that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] introduced a resolution proposing the creation of a committee to be appointed by the President of the Senate, representing both sides of this Chamber, for the purpose of advising a compromise, and that Senators on this side of the aisle supported the proposition and the Senators on the other side of the aisle voted it down. Later on the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] introduced a similar proposition, which was pending here at the time it was supplanted by the bipartisan conference. So all the initiative for a conference and for a compromise occurred upon this side of the aisle.

Mr. LENROOT. The Senator from Nebraska utterly forgets what he just said. What was it the Senator said with reference to the bipartisan conference and the initiative coming from that side? Does he not remember that he made the statement that after the motion to lay the motion to reconsider on the table he made the statement that this side said that the treaty was dead? That was after the resolution introduced by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE]. This is something that occurred subsequent to that.

The Senator from Nebraska undertook to have the Senate and the country believe that after the adjournment, and when this session began, the initiative came from the other side of the aisle. Now, I do not want to be personal, and I shall not go into it to any extent, but I am going just far enough to state just how it did come about. The fact is that the Senator from Nebraska throughout this controversy, since he has been willing to negotiate, has never evinced the slightest desire to negotiate upon a line that would secure a two-thirds vote to ratify the treaty, but his whole effort has seemed to be to pick off two or three or four Republicans in order to give that side a majority and put the onus on the Republican side for defeating the treaty in spite of the Democratic side. That has been his object apparently and not the object of securing the ratification of his treaty.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Have we not offered to the other side and is there not pending now a proposition of compromise by which we furnish 40 votes and invite you to furnish only 24?

Mr. LENROOT. A proposition the like of which I undertake to say no Senator has ever before seen, a proposition advanced by a Senator where he refuses to tell the Senate and the country what, in his judgment, his proposition means. He has declined two or three times to-day to do so.

The Senator from Nebraska was very busy trying to pick off four or five Republicans in order to make a majority for reservations without the slightest regard to securing a two-thirds vote. That is what the Senator from Nebraska has been busy about. There are some of us who have been busy trying to get a proposition which will secure a two-thirds vote. The Senator from Nebraska has been apparently utterly indifferent to that proposition, but many of his colleagues have not. There are many of his colleagues who sincerely desire to get together upon some proposition that will secure a two-thirds vote of the Senate.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President—

Mr. LENROOT. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I should like to inquire of the Senator if he has been busy upon this side of the aisle in trying to get any votes in favor of a compromise?

Mr. LENROOT. I have talked with many Senators.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Of course, the Senator has talked with many, but what effort has anyone on the other side made to get anyone upon this side of the aisle to support the compromise proposed upon the other side? Senators upon this side of the aisle have labored quite assiduously with Senators upon the other side of the aisle to get a two-thirds vote. I have not discovered that any great amount of persuasion from the other side to this side has been indulged in.

Mr. LENROOT. Possibly the Senator from Montana has been so unfortunately classed among those irreconcilables with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] that he has not been talked with so frequently as some other Democratic Members who appear to be more reasonable. I myself think that the Senator from Montana does not belong in any such class. I believe that the Senator from Montana does desire a ratification of the treaty, but I have had no evidence that the Senator from Nebraska does. He does desire to secure a majority vote for certain reservations, and apparently he will be entirely satisfied if he secures that.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Does not the Senator admit that I have been instrumental in making an offer of compromise?

Mr. LENROOT. I will answer that question when the Senator will give his construction of the compromise that he offers.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Will the Senator permit another question? Has the Senator from Wisconsin offered any compromise?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. What is it?

Mr. LENROOT. One that either has been offered or will be offered.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Has it been offered?

Mr. LENROOT. I will be very frank with the Senator from Nebraska. In so far as the substance of the reservation to article 10 already adopted by the Senate is concerned, there can be no compromise of the substance of that reservation. We may as well understand that very plainly.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I thought that was probably it. What about the substance and the meaning of the fourteenth reservation?

Mr. LENROOT. The substance and meaning of the fourteenth reservation as it is now prepared was practically agreed to in the bipartisan conference, including the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Was it as much agreed to as this bipartisan proposition which we are now putting up to the Senator?

Mr. LENROOT. More so, because the Senator well remembers—so long as we are going into what occurred in the bipartisan conference—that after we discussed the proposed changes in the fourteenth reservation for one entire afternoon, it was suggested and agreed that it seemed very clear that we would come to an understanding upon that, and we might pass to something else, and we did. No such agreement was ever made with reference to the reservation to article 10.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. But the Senator does not state that we came to an agreement. He says now that we might come to some agreement upon it. I want to say to the Senator that his obduracy as to the fourteenth reservation is almost worse even than his obduracy as to the reservation to article 10.

Mr. LENROOT. The Senator from Nebraska never offered a change in reservation 14 in conference except the one that was finally agreed to—except the original proposition that he had offered many times.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Oh, no; the Senator from Nebraska offered at least three propositions in connection with the reservation referred to and all were rejected.

Mr. LENROOT. To reservation 14?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. To reservation 14. None of my propositions to amend reservation 14 were accepted.

Mr. LENROOT. I have no recollection of that; but the Senator knows that we had practically come to an agreement as to the fourteenth reservation, and it was passed over with the understanding that there would be no difficulty as to that reservation.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I deny that we came to any more of an understanding as to reservation 14 than we did as to the reservation to article 10.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator from Wisconsin yield to me?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. Is it not true that six out of the eight members of the committee had practically come to an agreement on the reservation to article 10? Does the Senator say that he, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. KELLOGG], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. NEW], the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS], and myself did not urge the modification of the reservation to article 10 which had been submitted here by Senators on this side of the Chamber?

Mr. LENROOT. I do not.

Mr. NEW rose.

Mr. LENROOT. I want to finish. The Senator from Tennessee will remember that in the very midst of the discussion upon the reservation to article 10 I suggested that the Republican members of the conference should retire to another room and discuss the matter, which they did.

Mr. McKELLAR. Quite the contrary, Mr. President—

Mr. LENROOT. And while they were in that discussion, we were informed by our Democratic colleagues that we might as well adjourn until the next day, which we did.

Mr. McKELLAR. It was quite the contrary. My recollection about that is very distinct. As I recall, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. KELLOGG], with the acquiescence, at least, of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. NEW], thought that the modification ought to be agreed to; and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, suggested a conference; and that thereafter the matter fell through.

Mr. LENROOT. The Senator's recollection is not accurate.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. LENROOT. I yield.

Mr. NEW. I simply wish to say, in answer to what the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] has stated, that his recollection, at least as to the attitude of the Senator from Indiana, is wholly wrong. The Senator from Indiana never acquiesced in anything of the kind.

Mr. McKELLAR. Then the Senator from Indiana misled me in what he said and did on that occasion.

Mr. BORAH. I desire to ask if there was a stenographic report of the meeting?

Mr. LENROOT. There was not. Of course, it is fair to state of both sides that everything which was done was tentative, and it was so understood.

Mr. McKELLAR. I agree with the Senator from Wisconsin that it was all tentative; but there is not any doubt in the world that the only two who did not agree in substance on that occasion to that which had been reported as having been agreed upon by the majority of the conference, as I understand, were the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK].

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, to complete the history as to the initiative, inasmuch as the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] has made the statement that he did, this is exactly what occurred with reference to the bipartisan conference: There were negotiations going on informally between different Senators—Republican Senators and Democratic Senators—and finally matters reached a state where a Republican Senator suggested that certain Democrats see the Republican leader, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and ascertain if an agreement could not be made for an informal bipartisan conference. The Democrats acquiesced in that suggestion; they did see the Senator from Massachusetts; and as the result of that the bipartisan conference was held. That is the history of that conference. Perhaps the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] were not aware of the facts as they existed.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin has just stated with emphasis that there can be no change in the substance of the reservation to article 10. I think the Senator from Wisconsin is correct; that, in fact, if there is any change in substance the treaty can not be ratified. I presume that is precisely what the Senator meant. My information upon the matter with reference to this side of the Chamber is that there will be no yielding upon the substance of that reservation; but the Senator from Wisconsin knows that and understands that situation better than I do.

If there is to be no yielding upon the question of substance, then if we continue this debate any longer or continue the consideration of the treaty here before the Senate any longer, we shall be continuing it on a question of language, a question merely of verbiage. The Senator from Nebraska, as I understand, is equally positive that there can be no yielding to the Lodge resolution as it now is; that if the Lodge reservation stands as it is now written, so far as substance and principle are concerned, the opponents of the reservation will vote for the defeat of the treaty in case the reservation is attached.

I am gathering this information as best I may from the debate, because I am not familiar with what happened in the bipartisan conference and have not seen the process verbal of that conference. However, if that is the situation, then to continue this treaty here any longer is simply to kill time and deprive the Congress of the opportunity of transacting business which ought to be transacted.

So far as I am individually concerned, I need not restate my position, but I am concerned in some matters of legislation here which are of great importance to the country. Unfortunately, I presume, we on this side of the Chamber will be held responsible for those measures if they are not passed. I think, therefore, it is well for those who are leaders on the opposite side of the Chamber to consider whether or not they are willing to continue the discussion of the treaty upon the mere question of a change of language.

There must be something in the Lodge reservation, as a matter of principle, to which the Senator from Nebraska seriously objects. I do not believe the Senator from Nebraska would hold up the treaty upon a mere question of language. Either there is something in the reservation to which he objects as a matter of principle or else this controversy will resolve itself into a question of which party can get the greatest advantage here in the Senate Chamber for the campaign. You are either fighting over a principle which neither can yield or you are sparring for political advantage.

I do not think, Mr. President, there is any possible way to keep the treaty out of the campaign, whether we ratify it or not. The Republicans in New York met in convention on yesterday, and the action of the Republicans of New York, by reason of the power and leadership of the State, is generally quite indicative of what will probably be the action of the party. It is at least an indication of what we may expect in the campaign. Instead of keeping the treaty out of politics, instead of keeping it out of the campaign, the Republican leaders in New York put it in the very midst of the political controversy. It is now so far in the campaign that it can never be kept out of the campaign. While we talk of keeping it out of the campaign it intrudes itself into the campaign and takes a foremost and dominant position. Under the declarations made by the Republican leaders of New York, even if we should ratify the treaty to-morrow it would be the one issue, the dominating and controlling issue of the campaign of 1920. I will demonstrate that to Senators by a single paragraph and by the resolution which, as I am informed to-day, followed this paragraph.

The Republican leader of New York said:

I hope the treaty will be ratified with the reservations long before the presidential election. That will be done if the President permits it. If that is not done, then that is what I think the Republican Party ought to stand for.

That is, the treaty with reservations; but Mr. Root continued:

Immediately after the 4th of March, 1921, a Republican President should urge upon the society of nations the reform of the league covenant, so as to make it establish the rule of public right rather than the rule of mere expediency, so as to make the peace of the world rest primarily upon law and upon the effectiveness and enforcement of the law.

If this treaty should be ratified with the Lodge reservations either as they are written or as they may be modified in the matter of language, nevertheless, as has been stated now by the Republican leader of the greatest State in the Union, so far as political power is concerned, the first hour of the first day of the first year of the Republican administration should be made sacred by initiating a new conference for the purpose of re-writing the league covenant. The treaty would be in the very midst of the campaign, would it not? It would be the one issue in the campaign, and not only would it be in the campaign but

it would call into activity every foreign element in the United States, fighting not upon an American issue but upon what they conceive their rights should be under a League of Nations with reference to their friends in the Old World. However we may view it, therefore, we must face the situation as it is.

A year ago to-morrow the debate began in this Chamber on the League of Nations and the treaty. We are no nearer a settlement to-day than we were a year ago to-morrow. We have perhaps even more feeling and more antipathy toward the programs than we had at that time, because they were not then so thoroughly developed. We are within three months of the nomination of a President of the United States, and you can not any more keep the treaty out of the campaign of 1920 than you could stop midway over Niagara Falls after you had started. So, Mr. President, if we hold this treaty here for another week or another month, and debate it on the question of party advantage or mere verbiage, we are throttling legislation which ought to be passed and taking that responsibility upon ourselves before the country.

Not only does the Senator from Nebraska say that there can be no acceptance of the Lodge reservation as it now is, as I understand his argument, but it is inconceivable that the President of the United States could accept the Lodge reservation after his statement and after all he has said in regard to this matter. If the Lodge reservation is put on in substance and in principle, although we may change the language—the President has said it cuts the heart out of the covenant, that it destroys his handiwork, that it is utterly worthless for the purpose of building the peace of the world—can or will he accept it? Will Woodrow Wilson be the man to take a league that according to his own oft-times repeated statement would be worthless, a fraud, a deception, a cowardly surrender?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Has not the Senator from Idaho seen repeated statements in the press by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] that there must be substantial concessions upon the reservation to article 10 before he would agree to that reservation?

Mr. BORAH. I understand that is the position of the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. He has been repeatedly quoted to that effect in the press. I do not know whether or not it represents his view.

Mr. BORAH. I take it that that is the only legitimate inference which we can draw from the Senator's discussion here to-day. He says he has traveled nine-tenths of the way, but that the other tenth is the part which does the business; the other tenth is what effectuates the change in substance and principle. If the Senator from Nebraska did not regard that one-tenth as about as sacred a thing as is connected with this debate, he would yield it. In what position will the Senator from Nebraska and his party be in the campaign if he goes before the country saying, "I went nine-tenths of the way, but the other tenth did not amount to anything; the reason I did not yield the other tenth was simply a question of pride of authorship," or something of that kind. He will not undertake to occupy any such position as that. When we get into the campaign that one-tenth will swell into such proportions that it will far excel the nine-tenths, because under that one-tenth will be covered up the question of the life or death of the league in the view of the Democratic Party. What is this one-tenth? What does it cover? Will not the able Senator from Nebraska tell us? Is the one-tenth the principle, or is the one-tenth the pride?

The Senator from Nebraska has not been the leader of the other side of the Chamber for a number of months without Senators on both sides of the Chamber understanding his adroit leadership. If the Senator from Nebraska will rise in his place now and state to his colleagues and to the country that there is no difference between the Taft reservation and the Lodge reservation except a question of verbiage, he ends his fight upon this proposition. If he rises in his place and says there is a difference in principle, then he makes it impossible to ratify the treaty, under the declaration of the Senator from Wisconsin. What is the use of keeping it here before the Senate? We can afford to be frank; take a lesson from the irreconcilables and state exactly your position. [Laughter.] If the one-tenth does not mean anything, let us know it; if it does mean anything, as the Senator from Wisconsin says, let us have it; we can fight it out then. Let us know what this debate is about. We will confine our discussion to the one-tenth, if Senators opposing the reservation will tell us what the distinction is; if they do not tell us what the distinction is and do not tell the people what the

distinction is, it is altogether probable that we will not be able to agree at all.

I opine, Mr. President, that there is considerable bluffing, not upon the part of any particular Senator, but upon the part of all, about not fearing to go into the campaign. The Senator from Nebraska says, "We are not afraid to go into the campaign with that issue; we are not afraid of the popular disapproval of our position." It is a new thing in American politics to see such heroic striving to keep away from the issue which is going to make you sure for another four years. I venture to assert that if you go into the campaign with this issue, when it comes out of the campaign it will be stripped of reservations either mild or drastic.

I have had the honor since this campaign opened of speaking to 42 mass meetings upon the question of reservations and upon the fundamental principles which are involved in the league covenants. The audiences go to sleep upon the question of reservations. They say, as an old farmer over in Iowa said to me, "The question of reservations is a question of dispute between international lawyers. We do not know whether this 'unless' means the same thing as 'until,' or vice versa; but we do know that we do not want to be entangled and enmeshed in the affairs of Europe, and we do not want to be embroiled in her concerns, with which we have no interest."

If you get into the campaign, that is the question upon which you will fight out the campaign. When you stand before a popular audience, you will not stop to discuss the question between one word and other. There will come up from the people who are sitting before you, "What we want to know is whether or not you are in favor of mixing us in European affairs at all? We do not care whether you go in face foremost or back in, but are you going in?"

Let me give you an illustration. There has not yet been a candidate for the Presidency of the United States who has declared himself upon this question who has not declared, openly and without equivocation, that he is opposed to any league which in any way modifies the traditional foreign policy of the United States. Gen. Wood says, "I am in favor of the league, but I am opposed to modifying in any way or trammeling or embarrassing in the least the attitude of the United States in her relationship with foreign powers."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. BORAH. Just a moment.

Now, tell me, my friends, why it is that those who are getting ready to ask for the suffrages of the people of the United States are careful to advise them, in language which can not be misunderstood, that "I am opposed to modifying in any way the doctrines of Washington or the doctrines of James Monroe"? They have already felt the ground swell coming up from the popular voters that those two principles they will not sacrifice. When Mr. Hoover declares his position for a league—the candidate of the New York World for the nomination upon the other side—he declares the same thing: "I am for a league, but one which will protect absolutely the traditional foreign policy of the United States."

When Mr. Lowden declares his position he says:

I am for a league, but I am opposed to the United States hampering herself in any way in her dealings with foreign powers.

In the name of common honesty how can you write a league without sacrificing the traditional policy of the United States? When they get into the campaign they will say to the people: "That is our position." Very well. If you can not have a league without doing that, then I am opposed to it, and before the campaign has proceeded 30 days your league will have disappeared like the mists before the sun.

I addressed a letter to Mr. Cox, of Ohio, and asked him point-blank: "Are you in favor of ratifying this treaty as it came from Versailles?" He has been about 20 days reflecting upon that question. He has not replied. I am waiting with considerable concern and deep anxiety to know how he is going to answer that question. It was put in a little different language, because I gathered knowledge as I went along by reading the statements of Mr. Lowden and Gen. Wood, so I put the question directly. You upon the other side of the Chamber will not nominate a candidate for President who will declare before the people of the United States that he is for this league without reservations.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, it would be useless to nominate him.

Mr. BORAH. Exactly—perfectly useless. Therefore, let us get down to the real meat of this proposition. If you gentlemen, representing your convictions, do not propose to yield, let us take it into the campaign. There the people will settle it. If

the Senators upon this side have gone as far as they propose to go, if they believe that to go further would sacrifice the independence and the sovereignty of the United States, then there is only one tribunal which can ever settle this question, and that is the electorate—the only tribunal which should settle it, the only tribunal which in the last analysis should settle it.

But they say: "That makes it a football of politics." How do you settle questions in America except in elections? We do not have plebiscites. We have no method of settling questions by discharging the ministry and going to the country. We have no means to settle these questions except through the expression of those whom the people choose as their representatives. It is the only way known to the American Republic. It was the system which the fathers built—a representative Republic, assuming that when a man was elected he would carry out the pledges made to the people. Are not the people themselves as capable of determining whether or not they want to be embroiled in the affairs of Europe as they are of determining a tariff question? Has the Monroe doctrine ever been considered a foreign question? Is it not a domestic question? Have not the Republican Party and the Democratic Party so declared time and time again? If you will look at the platforms of the Republican Party since 1850, you will find no less than three times, when three of the greatest Republican leaders in the history of our party were running, they not only declared for the preservation of the Monroe doctrine but they declared for the maintenance of Washington's policy and against all entangling alliances with foreign powers. No one has ever heretofore considered it as unfit for party politics for the American people to have the right to say whether or not they should be embroiled in European concerns. As the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE] says, the Clayton-Bulwer treaty was an issue time after time.

But there is another phase to this proposition which we may as well face, and that is this: Who makes the issues in the campaign? Suppose that both sides of the Chamber here should resolve that this should not be an issue in the next campaign. Suppose we should ratify the treaty and then agree among ourselves and either by resolution or public statement declare that it is now taken out of party politics and should not be an issue in the campaign. Who controls the issues in the campaign? Why, that audience sitting down there in front of the speaker control the issues in the campaign. They will determine what issues they will pass upon, and the speaker will have to conform to their views—either for them or against them.

Imagine a Republican candidate for President writing a letter of acceptance and keeping silent upon this question of the treaty! He would be driven from the stump in 10 days as a shameless moral coward, and if there is anything in the world that the American people will not forgive it is moral cowardice.

Suppose a Democratic candidate should accept, and should keep silent upon this treaty, what would become of the followers of Woodrow Wilson in that fight? If you want to know, ponder a minute upon the situation of Mr. Lansing at the present time. He would be retired into innocuous desuetude if it was within his power by votes to do it.

The issue is now made. It has gone to the country. You can not mislead nor misrepresent it to the people. We may hold it here for a week or a month or two months, and discuss questions of verbiage; but the great proposition is now before the American people, and there it will remain until under the genius of the American Republic the great tribunal which determines its destiny passes upon it. Upon the ides of next November the death knell of the treaty will be read in the result or else we will go into the league with the backing and the public opinion of 110,000,000 people.

What is it worth if we do not do it? As I had the honor to say to a distinguished Englishman a few weeks ago, "What is your treaty worth until the American people pass upon it?" These gentlemen should study the genius of American institutions. This treaty is a piece of white paper until the American people get behind it. Without their moral support it is utterly worthless. How many of these gentlemen who are now asking for ratification would not retreat if the great mass of the American people were to denounce it?

We conform here sooner or later to the only king that we know, and that is the king of public opinion. If we want to get into this league and stay there, if we want to make it permanent, if we believe in it and believe that it should be permanent, then we want the judgment of the American people as a people behind it.

I hold no brief for the President of the United States; neither do I hold any brief against him personally, although I

am against his proposition. Notwithstanding that fact, one must have a very deep admiration for the man in the White House, who, notwithstanding the adverse circumstances under which he fights, has notified the world that this treaty and league must stand as they are written, and has refused so far to yield a single inch upon that proposition. It does not prove that the President is right, but it proves that he has faith in his proposition. It proves that he has the invincible faith of Peter the Hermit, who would have reformed the world in another way. It proves that he is unwilling to shirk going before the American people with this matter. And if the President of the United States, after having declared his position in the unmistakable way that he has—that this, and this alone, will satisfy the demands of the world and compose the world's strife—yields upon questions of principle and substance, his place in history will descend to that of sheer expediency instead of statecraft. It is all right for these trimmers and compromisers who write in here to talk about yielding, but the President can not yield with honor that which he has declared would destroy his league. It is equally true that men who have said that certain reservations are the least that will protect the rights of our people can not yield without betraying their country. As for the irreconcilables, their position is known to all—they will never yield. Why take further time therefore? Let it go to the people; let those decide it upon whose shoulders its stupendous obligations must rest.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President, during the course of the discussion in which the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] recently participated, a question was raised as to the accuracy of a statement made by Baron Goto, of Japan, and published in the Washington Post of April 20, 1919. The statement made was as follows:

In an astonishingly frank interview Baron Goto declared that Japan considered herself the spokesman of all oriental peoples, and, having already obtained the support of President Wilson, would not give up her fight for racial equality.

"Both President Wilson and Col. House voted with Japan for racial equality at the peace conference," Goto said.

In the interest of the truth of history, I stated at that time that I was in possession of information which seemed to deny the accuracy of Baron Goto's statement—if, indeed, it had ever been made—and since then I have confirmed my view, and I promised at that time to lay it before the Senate.

The Japanese representatives at the peace conference, led by Baron Makino, as the Senators will recall, in March, 1919, asked that a resolution be passed, first by the conference and then by the council, granting racial equality as a principle between nations—a proposition which, upon its face, seemed to commend itself to idealists and philosophers; but when subjected to the test of practical application and experience, the serious character and purpose of the resolution at once became manifest. Therefore, at that time I took it upon myself to address the American delegation in Paris, at the same time informing the western Representatives in Congress of the fact and inviting them to participate in the protest. The first telegram I sent to the American representatives read as follows:

"MARCH 20, 1919.

"Japanese demand for free immigration and other privileges has aroused Pacific coast. Evidence of Japanese coming over border and contemplated land purchase by Japanese company in Mexico near California State line and enormously increased Japanese agricultural aggression have alarmed the people. These problems are domestic, and league constitution should under no circumstances concede Japanese demand. Japan now excludes Chinese coolies and has recently deported 500 such persons from Japan."

The second telegram, dated March 23, was addressed to Lansing, Secretary of State, as follows:

"Any declaration in constitution on 'race equality or just treatment' may be construed to give jurisdiction to league over immigration, naturalization, elective franchise, land ownership, and intermarriage, and should be avoided. An affirmative declaration that these are domestic questions should be made in consonance with established American policy. Believe western Senators and others will oppose any loophole by which oriental people will possess such equality with white race in United States. It is vital question of self-preservation."

At the White House conference President Wilson declined to answer the direct question as to how the American representatives had voted, the council having decided to keep confidential its proceedings.

Acknowledgment, however, was made to me by Mr. Lansing, without indicating what action had been taken by our representatives, but it was given in the press that, while the Japanese resolution received a majority of votes, it was lost for failure

to receive unanimous approval. Who, then, refused unanimous consent? The facts were brought out by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] in quoting extensively from the book of Dr. Dillon. Dr. Dillon tells us of the circumstances surrounding the action of the conference when this matter was brought up. These are his words:

"Then came the burning question of the equality of nations. The Polish delegate arose and opposed on the formal ground that nothing ought to be inserted in the preamble which was not dealt with also in the body of the covenant, as otherwise it would be no more than an isolated theory devoid of organic connection with the whole. The Japanese delegates delivered speeches of cogent argument and impressive debating power. Baron Makino made out a very strong case for the equality of nations. Viscount Chinda followed in a trenchant discourse, which was highly appreciated by his hearers, nearly all of whom recognized the justice of the Japanese claim. The Japanese delegates refused to be dazzled by the circumstance that Japan was to be represented on the executive council as one of the five great powers, and that the rejection of the proposed amendment could not therefore be construed as a diminution of her prestige. This consideration, they retorted, was wholly irrelevant to the question whether or not the nations were to be recognized as equal. They ended by refusing to withdraw their modified amendment and calling for a vote. The result was a majority for the amendment. Mr. Wilson thereupon announced that a majority was insufficient to justify its adoption, and that nothing less than absolute unanimity could be regarded as adequate. At this a delegate objected: 'Mr. Wilson, you have just accepted a majority for your own motion respecting Geneva; on what grounds, may I ask, do you refuse to abide by a majority vote on the amendment of the Japanese delegation?' 'The two cases are different,' was the reply. 'On the subject of the seat of the league unanimity is unattainable.' This closed the official discussion."

So there is no doubt about the action of the conference, but there was a doubt raised by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] as to the vote of the President. The Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] drew the inference from the statement of Dr. Dillon that the President voted with the minority; in other words, that his vote, as I am led to believe, with the vote of Lloyd-George, prevented that unanimity which was necessary to carry the resolution.

But how did the President vote? The Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] has called our attention to an article by Mr. Patrick Gallagher, who is a well-known authority on Far Eastern affairs. After his return from a prolonged residence in the Philippines and China he became associated with the Far Eastern Review, of New York City. He attended the peace conference to report on the eastern angle of the discussion, and since his return has affiliated himself with the Far Eastern Syndicate, with headquarters in Washington. In an elaborate article in the issue of the magazine Asia, of September, 1919, Mr. Gallagher bears this testimony:

"Every nation represented at the meeting, with the exception of the United States and Great Britain, supported Makino's amendment through their spokesmen on the commission for the League of Nations."

The Makino amendment was that providing for the acceptance of the principles of the "equality" of nations and the "just treatment" of their nationals. The previous demand for bare racial equality which had been made, was, he states, trimmed down to read, "acceptance of the principle of the equality of nations and just treatment of their nationals." He goes on to say:

"I notice frequent assertions in the newspapers that Makino's amendment was 'defeated by a narrow majority.' That is utterly incorrect. It was carried by a sweeping majority, including China. Dr. Koo, very properly, made one of the best speeches supporting the Japanese baron. Racial and national equality suffered defeat at the hands of Woodrow Wilson, at the behest of Lord Robert Cecil. After everybody had spoken, Baron Makino asked the President if his amendment was adopted."

"The President said, 'No. That requires unanimity.'"

"In plain words, Baron Makino and the Japanese were tricked out of their just rights and a sweeping victory in the commission on the league of nations. The Japanese were seriously annoyed. The younger Japanese newspaper men, who were present in Paris in strong force, were openly angry."

Of course, if the President stated, as generally understood, that unanimity was necessary, that doubtless was the rule of the council in matters of importance.

The writer of the article is apparently pro-Japanese and is putting the Japanese case. He seems to speak with authority, and, of course, his statement bears out my contention that the

President voted with the minority and hence defeated that unanimity which was necessary to carry the amendment.

I have also the testimony of a distinguished correspondent, Ray Stannard Baker, who has written a series of articles on the business of the conference. He says, briefly:

"The Japanese felt strongly regarding the defeat in their effort to obtain the racial recognition clause in the covenant, and at once in some of their extreme newspapers there began a sharp attack on President Wilson as the cause of their discomfiture. The Osaki Mainichi Deupas, for example, referred to the President's 'dangerous justice,' and charged him with being a 'female demon,' a term vividly denunciatory to the oriental mind. Whatever happened at the conference, the President had to take the lion's share of the blame for it."

Again, I find in the Living Age of November 22, 1919, taken from the Chus Koron of October 6, 1919, an article by Ryutaro Nagai, the following:

"The Anglo-American spirit in question was clearly seen at work during the early progress of the peace conference, as when the British and United States delegations united in supporting the Chinese claims against the Japanese. It was, indeed, only when Premier Orlando went home in resentment at President Wilson's opposition to the Italian acquisition of Fiume, an event which gave occasion to all the anti-American element to ventilate itself, that through the mediative efforts of Mr. Balfour the Anglo-American combine at the conference was persuaded to allow Japan's contention. All this while Premier Lloyd-George caused the newspapers under his control to attack Japan for what they represented to be her aggressive policy in the Far East."

"Again, it was England and America who were most solid in their opposition to Japan's racial-equality proposition, so much so that the combine winked at the unfair ruling of President Wilson, who declared it lost, although it was supported by 12 votes against 6."

Because the council enjoined secrecy, as before noted, the President, in answer to Senator JOHNSON's direct question, said he was not, at the time of the White House conference, free to give the information. But since then the news has been circulated by correspondents and publicists. The most convincing statement was given to me, for my information as a Senator, by one in a position to know. I will respect the confidence by withholding the name of the writer, but in view of the circumstances I do not see why the Senate should not possess this authentic statement, which is as follows:

"I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of November 21, 1919, in which you ask to be advised as to the action of the American commissioners at the Paris conference with respect to the Japanese demand for 'racial equality.'"

"In reply, I hasten to assure you that the Japanese demand for a 'racial equality' clause in the covenant of the League of Nations was never brought up for discussion or vote at any plenary session of the peace conference, although it did form the text of a statement (inclosed herewith) made by Baron Makino at the plenary session of April 28, 1919. It was, however, introduced in a meeting of the League of Nations commission on February 13, 1919. On that day President Wilson was not in attendance at the meeting, and at the request of the representatives of several powers, other than the United States, the clause was withdrawn by the Japanese delegate without a formal vote being taken upon it. At a subsequent meeting of this commission on April 11, 1919, the Japanese delegate proposed a general statement as to 'national equality' to be embodied in the preamble of the covenant, which was rejected after the taking of a formal vote. This vote showed that certain powers were in favor of the proposed amendment to the preamble, but no count was taken of the negative votes. The United States did not vote for the amendment, and President Wilson, who was presiding at the meeting, ruled that inasmuch as the amendment had not received unanimous support it had been rejected. This was the last attempt made by the Japanese representatives in Paris to obtain formal recognition of either 'racial' or 'national equality.'"

So there can be no manner of doubt that, notwithstanding the statement attributed to Baron Goto published in our RECORD last September, and, according to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED], uncontradicted, that it is clearly a fact that the American representative in the person of the President, possibly in connection with Lloyd-George, defeated the Japanese proposal for racial equality.

My informant inclosed a statement by Baron Makino at the plenary session of the peace conference, April 28, 1919, after he had been defeated.

Baron Makino explains the grounds for the amendment proposed by the Japanese delegation to the commission with a view

to secure recognition in the covenant for the equality of all nations and of their subjects. He said:

"I had first on the 13th of February an opportunity of submitting to the commission of the League of Nations our amendment to the covenant, embodying the principle of equal and just treatment to be accorded to all aliens who happen to be the nationals of the States which are deemed advanced enough and fully qualified to become members of the league, making no distinction on account of race or nationality."

Then he discussed the principle, and he continues, referring to the vote:

"On the next day"—that is, on the 14th day of February—"when the draft of the covenant was reported at a plenary session of the conference without the insertion of our amendment, I had the privilege of expressing our whole-hearted sympathy and readiness to contribute our utmost to any and every attempt to found and secure an enduring peace of the world. At the same time I made a reservation that we would again submit our proposal for consideration."

In closing, he said:

"I feel it my duty to declare clearly on this occasion that the Japanese Government and people feel poignant regret at the failure of the commission to approve of their just demand for laying down a principle aiming at the adjustment of this long-standing grievance, a demand that is based upon a deep-rooted national conviction. They will continue in their insistence for the adoption of this principle by the league in future."

Here Baron Makino serves notice that he shall not abide by the decision, and, therefore, we must be prepared, in case the proposed covenant of the league is adopted, to meet that demand from time to time, unless we expressly and specifically take jurisdiction of such subjects from the league.

I voted for reservation No. 4, proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], in order that Baron Makino might not find the league a tribunal to which he could appeal. The Lodge reservation reads as follows:

"The United States reserves to itself exclusively the right to decide what questions are within its domestic jurisdiction and declares that all domestic and political questions relating wholly or in part to its internal affairs, including immigration, labor, coastwise traffic, the tariff, commerce, the suppression of traffic in women and children and in opium and other dangerous drugs, and all other domestic questions, are solely within the jurisdiction of the United States and are not under this treaty to be submitted in any way either to arbitration or to the consideration of the council or of the assembly of the League of Nations, or any agency thereof, or to the decision or recommendation of any other power."

Of course, we have always contended, irrespective of the reservation, that questions of immigration and the like were domestic in their character and wholly and exclusively within the jurisdiction of a sovereign country, but it did no harm to emphasize it or to interpret, if you please, the meaning of the language of the covenant, so far as we were concerned, and while the power was in our hands to determine finally the question of jurisdiction.

We can not submit to any foreign tribunal the domestic question of who shall come into our country and enjoy its privileges.

In a country which deals generously with matters of a political character, involving equality and liberty, it may almost seem harsh to those not familiar with the facts to deny equality to any nation or to any race or people. I said that Lloyd-George had joined with President Wilson according to the evidence, and he joined because the Australian Commonwealth and New Zealand and Canada and South Africa, and all the great tributary colonies of the British Empire, were of one mind on the question of denying equality to the Japanese on account of what it implied. In practice "equality" meant for the white race the abandonment of its standards and tended to destroy the very ideals which had been concretely established. By the submergence of the white race their standards and ideals would go with them. There would remain only Japanese domination. We receive their diplomats, their travelers, their students, in our homes and in our schools on terms of equality, and all their nationals already in the country of every class enjoy the equal protection of the laws and have equal access to the courts. What is the equality they seek?

It is not a question of personal equality as between man and man that is involved at all in this discussion. It is that legal equality under which the Japanese would claim the right freely to come into the United States, or into Australia, if you please, just as do the nationals of any other country; it is that equality under which they would claim the right of naturalization, just as the nationals of other countries, of citizenship, of the elective franchise, of intermarriage, and of the holding of land.

By actual experience we find that we can not admit that equality involving all these things, because these aliens are capable of displacing the people who are now upon the soil, the white men and women who have pioneered the land, developed it, in mine and field, reared their institutions, political and social, and who, when the time comes, contribute their sons to fight the battles of their country. The aliens who wish to come in on a parity with native Americans have all the industry, but have not the assimilable quality by which they will blend and make a homogeneous race. Physically they are incapable of that assimilation; and the laws of several States deny them the privilege of intermarriage with the whites, based upon physiological laws which are well understood in this Chamber. The issue of such marriages—Eurasians or mestizos, they are called in Asia—have brought out, we know from experience, the evils which inhere in both races; and such a mongrel or hybrid race supplanting the Caucasian in California would be the death of the political and social life of the country. Where it is desirable, intermarriage is the only source of racial equality.

These aliens have no conception of our form of government, but still adhere with loyalty to their system of government and are governed by their consuls. They respond to the call of their consuls; and it is said that, in a military sense, their presence in large numbers, they being mostly military reservists, is a positive peril in case there should be any conflict between the countries.

Naturally the Japanese are gregarious and form a solid block. Ever since Chinese exclusion in 1884 they have been coming into this country, and they remain fixed and unchangeable. They are very prolific, and their children are trained, before and after regular hours, in Japanese schools. Denied agricultural land by State law in California, they are taking it in the names of their native children, who are ipso facto citizens under the Federal Constitution. They make the Constitution the instrument for law evasion.

I think, then, it is apparent that the danger ought to be checked. I shall not now go into that question, as I rose merely for the purpose of setting at rest the facts concerning the peace conference in their consideration of the resolution providing for the equality of races. I desire at the same time, however, to explain what that equality means—a word so pleasing to the ear and which is accepted politically, in a general sense, by us all.

We can not on terms of political equality or of social equality or of commercial or industrial equality admit freely the Japanese without inevitably involving the destruction of the American population now upon the soil. It is a question of self-preservation. There is no other question involved. If we did admit them, there would be abundant production, if that is the only end and purpose of our Government; but I am sure the Senate will agree with me in the statement that that is perhaps one of the least purposes of our Government. It is to produce and protect and to build up a nation of men and women who are homogeneous, believing in the principles of free government, and ready with their lives, if necessary, to defend them. That is the spirit of Americanism. The infiltration of an alien and nonassimilable race will destroy the American population and with it all that we hold dear.

The penetration by the Asiatics of the western coast of North America has raised, therefore, a very serious and fundamental question, and it can not, in the nature of things, be confined to any one section of the country. We are busy making preparations in Congress and in the legislatures of the Western States to correct this evil, first, by denying them the privilege of acquiring the soil—for without the soil there can be no race; there can be no free people; there can be no pursuit of life, liberty, and happiness.

Without the soil the people expelled by the incursions of the foreigner become vagrant and vagabond. It requires no flight of the imagination to see the fruits of such a policy borne in abundance by the development of the lawless and the criminal, by the I. W. W.'s and the Bolsheviks, because well might the people, driven off the soil by the pressure of these aliens, say "The Government under whose flag we live has failed to protect us"; and they would turn from love to hatred toward those institutions which they had believed would shelter them against—against what? Against the impossible competition of a man who can not assimilate and who will not take up the burdens of society and government, either in peace or in war, but who dedicates his life to unremitting labor, knowing neither hours, nor holidays, nor social, nor political, nor religious duties, but pursuing, to the exclusion of everything else, the acquisition of mere wealth.

Let me in a word show the results: I was told by the Rev. Dr. Lathrop, which impressed me very much, that he went to a

farmhouse where he was accustomed to meet a family of Americans, the unit of a great Nation, in which he took a tremendous pride, and he saw the house dismantled while the orchard flourished. He then learned that Japanese had taken possession of this white man's house, either having acquired the land by lease or by purchase. The loss to that community and the loss to the State and to the Nation of the farmer and his family was, he well knew, irreparable. Without such units composing the community and the State there can be no State and no Nation.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. LODGE. I move an executive session with closed doors. The motion was agreed to, and the doors were closed. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. LODGE. I move that the Senate adjourn. The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, February 21, 1920, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATIONS.

*Executive nominations received by the Senate February 20 (legislative day of February 18), 1920.*

##### UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

E. J. Smith, of Denison, Tex., to be United States attorney, eastern district of Texas, vice Clarence Merritt, resigned, effective March 1, 1920.

##### COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY.

Frederick Lockwood Peacock, of New York, to be hydrographic and geodetic engineer in the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey, in the Department of Commerce (by promotion from junior hydrographic and geodetic engineer), vice Harrison R. Bartlett, resigned.

#### CONFIRMATIONS.

*Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 20 (legislative day of February 18), 1920.*

##### REGISTERS OF LAND OFFICES.

James R. Sharp to be register of the land office at Rapid City, S. Dak.  
Charles E. Marshall to be register of the land office at Phoenix, Ariz.  
William B. Dickson to be register of the land office at Dickinson, N. Dak.  
James Y. Callahan to be register of the land office at Guthrie, Okla.  
Hayden M. White to be register of the land office at Buffalo, Wyo.  
Carl H. Massie to be register of the land office at Newcastle, Wyo.

##### RECEIVERS OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Frank B. Kinyon to be receiver of public moneys at Boise, Idaho.  
Charles R. Yeoman to be receiver of public moneys at Newcastle, Wyo.

##### POSTMASTERS.

###### ALASKA.

Amy Howell, Petersburg.

###### FLORIDA.

Albert E. Lounds, Crescent City.  
Edward L. Powe, De Land.  
William J. Forbes, Pensacola.  
Charles F. Hopkins, St. Augustine.  
Philip M. Elder, Sanford.  
Edward O. Sawyers, Zolfo Springs.  
James A. Haiston, Cocoa.

###### GEORGIA.

J. D. Long, Bremen.  
Raymond W. Clancy, Darien.  
Benjamin L. Cumbus, Hahira.  
Willie W. Brown, Jonesboro.  
Roger H. Clark, Louisville.  
Sarah K. Scovill, Oglethorpe.  
Ben H. McLarty, Soperton.

###### KENTUCKY.

Owen Daugherty, Caneyville.  
John V. Dickinson, Manchester.  
Elvin E. Pritchard, Williamsburg.

## MISSOURI.

James R. Pollock, Campbell.

## MONTANA.

Walter V. Grimes, Dillon.  
Hattie E. Fest, Polson.

## NEW HAMPSHIRE.

George F. Plummer, Ashland.  
Edward J. Maley, Newport.  
Arthur M. Rolfe, Salem Depot.  
John E. Sullivan, Somersworth.  
Addie J. Faulkner, West Swanzey.

## NEW YORK.

John J. Drumm, Cedarhurst.  
John A. Hendrickson, Farmingdale.  
George A. Hoffman, Floral Park.  
Carrie A. Kinn, Hewlett.  
John J. Breen, Mineola.  
William Nacey, Oswego.

## NORTH CAROLINA.

Jesse W. Wood, Littleton.  
James L. Bivens, Marshville.  
Rosabelle L. Chestnutt, Snow Hill.  
Lillian D. Williams, Stantonsburg.

## SOUTH CAROLINA.

Howard A. Littlejohn, Belton.  
Cecil S. Rice, Denmark.  
Edgar E. Poag, Rock Hill.

## WYOMING.

Flossie A. Speckman, Glenrock.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, February 20, 1920.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Infinite Spirit, Father of all souls, we lift up our hearts in gratitude and praise to Thee, that under the dispensation of Thy providence the course of human events has been upward not downward, forward not backward; hence we confidently look forward to the coming of Thy kingdom in all its glory, in the fullness of time, when every man shall know the truth, the truth that makes him free; and the ruling passion shall be to serve, not to be served; and brotherly love have its sway in accordance with the laws which Thou hast ordained. In the spirit of the Master. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

READING OF WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS ON FEBRUARY 23.

The SPEAKER. Under the order of the House the Chair was authorized to designate a Member to read Washington's Farewell Address on Monday, the 23d. Under that authority the Chair designates Mr. RODENBERG, of Illinois.

## BRIDGE ACROSS ROANOKE RIVER, N. C.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill H. R. 12351.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill H. R. 12351, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 12351) to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the Roanoke River in Halifax County, N. C.

Be it enacted, etc., That the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge authorized by act of Congress approved March 1, 1919, to be built by the county of Halifax, N. C., across Roanoke River between Hills Ferry and the ferry near the town of Halifax, in said county and State, are hereby extended one and three years, respectively, from the date of approval hereof.

Sec. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there any amendment?

Mr. KITCHIN. No.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. KITCHIN, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

## SPECIAL MESSENGER AND ASSISTANT PAIR CLERK.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of a resolution, which I send to the Clerk's desk to be read for information.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That William E. Kenney be, and he is hereby, appointed a special messenger and assistant pair clerk to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of Kenneth Romney, named in the resolution adopted by the House May 19, 1919, to be effective from September 16, 1919.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, how is it that this does not come from the chairman of the Committee on Accounts?

Mr. HUMPHREYS. This is one of the minority employees that were provided for in the resolution adopted on the 19th of May, when the House organized. Mr. Romney was named in that resolution for this place. Mr. Romney was formerly in the office of the Sergeant at Arms, and at the request of the Sergeant at Arms he remained there for some little while, up until the 19th of September, whatever the date here shows. Another young man was put in the place temporarily to fill that place. It then developed that the Sergeant at Arms was going to retain Mr. Romney permanently in his office, and he so notified us, and this is to fill that place. It is one of the regular minority places.

Mr. GARNER. It is already provided for by law. It is no new place.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Yes. It is one of the regular minority employees.

Mr. WALSH. Is this retroactive?

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Yes. This man has been on the job ever since the 19th of September.

Mr. WALSH. Who has been paying him?

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Nobody.

Mr. WALSH. Has he not been receiving any pay?

Mr. HUMPHREYS. No.

Mr. DYER. Has he been doing any work?

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. What is the pay?

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Eighteen hundred dollars, I think.

Mr. DYER. How much time has he been giving to the work?

Mr. HUMPHREYS. The same amount of time that every pair clerk gives every day.

Mr. WALSH. Has this been referred to the Committee on Accounts?

Mr. HUMPHREYS. No. This has not been referred to the Committee on Accounts. It would not belong to the Committee on Accounts.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. He is one of the minority employees. The custom for years has been at the organization of a Congress for the minority to offer a resolution for the employment of the person. This changes the designation of the person, not of the office?

Mr. HUMPHREYS. No.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I do not know why it has not been brought in before.

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman is touching upon an interesting story. I will not object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing an index of the conference report on the railroad bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland asks unanimous consent to print in the RECORD an index of the conference report on the railroad bill. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. Who prepared it?

Mr. LINTHICUM. It was prepared in my office.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LONERGAN. Mr. Speaker, as to-morrow will mark the fourth anniversary of the Battle of Verdun, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on that historical event and the achievements of the French Army.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks on the achievements of the French Army. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

## LEGISLATIVE, EXECUTIVE, AND JUDICIAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 12610, the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH] will please take the chair.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 12610, the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, with Mr. LONGWORTH in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 12610, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 12610) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and for other purposes.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR].

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, yesterday I arose to a question of what I believed to be personal privilege to reply to a statement appearing in the Washington Post of day before yesterday. I will read that brief portion which I felt entitled me to speak in my own behalf at that time.

In the Washington Post of February 18 is the following statement:

The chairman of the subcommittee was Representative JAMES A. FREAR—

Referring to the aircraft committee report—

and the Democratic national committee charges he favored the McLemore resolution forbidding Americans to take passage on ocean liners, as well as a resolution favoring an embargo on the sale of munitions to the Allies.

It is further charged by the Democratic national committee that Mr. FREAR voted against war with Germany, against conscription, against the espionage act, and against the first war revenue bill, "amongst others."

I have omitted portions of the statement, in order to get the specific bills and votes of which the Democratic national committee complains. It has no direct bearing on the report and no remote relation to the report of the aircraft committee, but I wish to meet it squarely at the time it is made.

The purpose of this statement from the Democratic national committee, as I assume, was to discredit the report on aviation made by the committee of which I am a member and chairman, appointed over my protest. Let me say, I preferred not to serve and afterwards tendered my resignation, which was refused. But that is only an incident. The report has been made to the House. Four thousand pages of testimony have been submitted, with our findings, so that Members of Congress can determine whether or not the facts therein set forth are true.

At the outset of our hearings last July and prior to the swearing of a single witness, Mr. Homer Cummings came before our committee. He is the chairman of the national Democratic committee. He vouched for a statement given out to the press before a witness was heard which discredited the purpose of this committee and called it a political investigation, partisan in character, but admitted before the committee that he had no evidence on which to base that statement except his own personal judgment.

When informed that the House had unanimously voted for the passage of the resolution, he criticized the House for its action and said it would result in no good. I cared nothing about his judgment, but from that day to this, through the press, he has constantly given out through the Democratic national committee reflections upon the acts of this aircraft committee. We have endeavored to make a fair and nonpartisan investigation from start to finish. I ask any Member, from now on until the matter shall come before the House for discussion, to indicate a single line in the hearings, of 4,000 pages, where there has been a word of partisanship or politics injected from the majority members of the committee.

Now, I wish briefly to take up the objections that he presents against the acceptance of this report at 100 per cent value.

The first statement he makes is that I opposed tabling the McLemore resolution on March 17, 1916, a year before the war. I did. I have no apologies to make for that, never have made any, never propose to make any. The McLemore resolution, as we all know, was based upon a situation which arose after the Secretary of State had written to the belligerent countries a letter in which he said it was "a doubtful right" to ride upon their armed merchant vessels, and President Wilson was thereafter elected because he kept us out of war. I am not going

to discuss the resolution. That is one reason why I did not care to discuss the question of personal privilege yesterday or to enter into the merits of the proposition. I desire to say this: That I voted my best judgment and the following gentlemen voted with me. I ask the House to pay attention to their names, to determine whether the House will accept any reports or any recommendations made by these gentlemen hereafter, for Mr. Cummings, chairman of the Democratic national committee, objects to them on the same ground. These gentlemen voted with me on the McLemore resolution:

Mr. JULIUS KAHN, present chairman of the Military Affairs Committee.

Mr. TOM BUTLER, chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee.

Mr. JOE FORDNEY, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee.

Dr. FESS, chairman of the Committee on Education.

Senator LENROOT, promoted to the other branch of Congress.

Mr. MANN of Illinois, who was then the minority leader and one of the ablest Members of the House.

Mr. MONDELL, the present majority leader.

Mr. REAVIS, chairman of one of the subcommittees with myself upon the war-expenditures investigation.

Mr. STENERSON, chairman of the Post Office Committee.

Mr. ESCH, chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. TOWNER, chairman of the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Mr. VOLSTEAD, chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. Kent, who was appointed by the President of the United States a member of the Tariff Commission in recognition of his ability and past public record.

Mr. LONGWORTH, the gentleman who at present occupies the chair just vacated by the Speaker.

Mr. MADDEN, a gentleman whom we all respect very highly.

And Uncle JOE CANNON, a patriot second to none.

Think of it! I am criticized by the Democratic national committee for being found in such eminent company.

In 1916 there was an election, and this matter was thrashed out by self-anointed patriots in my State, and I received the largest majority I ever had in the district—in a State that furnished more volunteer soldiers in proportion to its population than any other State in the Union.

But for the purposes of the argument I am going to admit that I made a mistake in being found in the company of these distinguished gentlemen. Is that any excuse or justification for the expenditure by American officials of \$1,000,000,000 appropriated by Congress for aeroplanes and only getting 213 flaming coffins at the front after 19 months of war? I will establish in your minds the fact that they were "flaming coffins," in the judgment of the men who flew them, before I get through.

The war vote is second among Chairman Cummings's complaints. Yes; I voted against the war. Judging from absolute lack of war preparations and waste of one thousand millions of dollars without getting aircraft, I might suggest many reasons if necessary. I found myself in distinguished company in that vote, because the gentleman who was then the leader of the Democratic majority of the House, now present, Mr. KITCHIN, throughout the war bore the brunt of all the labors of the great finance committee of the House, the Committee on Ways and Means, and is entitled to the thanks of the country for his untiring work, he voted the same way that I did. Sitting here immediately in front of me is a distinguished old gentleman who voted the same way—the oldest and one of the most honored in the House. I wonder if you are ashamed of him. A Democrat, yes; a man whom we all highly admire, who proudly wears the emblems of 40 battles of the Civil War in which he participated, Gen. SHERWOOD, rose from private to general. I am found in his company. Think of Homer Cummings, the politician, compared with Gen. SHERWOOD, the patriot. I am found in the company of Mr. Van Dyke, another Democrat, now deceased, who was the commander of the Spanish-American War Veterans at the time we cast that vote in April, 1917. Also with ROYAL C. JOHNSON, a soldier and patriot in the war. My friends, I can name any number of gentlemen whom the country know and respect above this man Cummings, but I do not care to discuss the votes we cast at this late day. That is past. That is water over the wheel, and our districts have returned us again. I do want to ask this, however: What justification does that afford Cummings for criticizing a report which says in so many words that \$6,000,000 was wasted experimenting on a Bristol plane when there was no possible excuse for attempting to put a Liberty motor into the English Bristol? What justification is Cummings's criticism of me for waste of \$17,000,000 for a "Standard J" training plane which everyone knew, or ought to have known, at the start could not be used, because of its dan-

gerous construction, and was discarded after 1,660 worthless planes had been built? Why did not these responsible American officials build any one of a half dozen recognized types of fighting planes that were used by our allies throughout the war?

What justifies Cummings's charge against me when Director Ryan was spending \$50,000,000 for flaming coffins that needlessly caused the death of many American aviators who were compelled to fly in them, as I propose to show before I get through? What justification for the needless loss of valuable lives of American aviators? Mr. Cummings, chairman of the Democratic national committee, criticizes me for my two votes. He criticizes at the same time the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. KITCHIN, the gentleman from Ohio, Gen. SHERWOOD, and every other man who voted as I did, although all of us voted for every other proposition that was offered to carry on the war thereafter. Why, the Democratic platform during the Civil War declared that war was a failure, and yet Cummings criticizes those who voted their convictions on a matter that involved this country in the horrible war then being fought in Europe.

Conscription? Of course, they lie about that as they have lied heretofore and will hereafter. I voted to admit volunteering in an effort to raise an army after war was declared. I never questioned but what that vote was right then; I believed it then and I believe it now. My father, who is still living, was commander of the Grand Army of the Republic of this District then. He served three and a half years as a volunteer during the Civil War. He believed the chance to volunteer was right and I believed it was right. My son was one of the first to volunteer in the war, and returned to his wife and baby after over two years' service. Who did I have in my company on the vote favoring volunteers? Ex-Speaker CLARK, who gave his boy to the service, as I did mine. The American people think more of the little finger of CHAMP CLARK than they do of the whole anatomy of Homer Cummings, who has pursued from start to finish bushwhacking political attacks against our committee. I did not vote against conscription, but voted for it as a necessary war measure, and Mr. Cummings's statement to the contrary is false and childish; but if true, it had no relation to the aviation committee's report.

Now as to the embargo. That is the next thing that Mr. Cummings, through the Democratic national committee, has charged me with voting against. Why, gentlemen, no embargo bill ever came before the House; it never even came out of the committee. That is a fair sample of the falsehoods which Mr. Cummings promised would be printed, and I submit no reliance can be placed on statements from such a source.

As to the espionage law, I voted for it. He charges I did not, and that is another falsehood. I have sometimes doubted the method of its administration in different forums, but it was a war measure and we accepted it as such.

I voted for every war measure after war was declared, and Mr. Cummings is again wrong. That is only another falsehood by this man, who is seeking to discredit the report of our committee by striking at it over my shoulders. Cummings has been declared unfit to be chairman of the Democratic national committee by high authority. I submit his present statement is not honest but it is the act of a prejudiced politician; it is maliciously false, and the American people do not put any reliance in it or in him, and they will never be deceived by his effort to cover up and whitewash incompetent responsible aircraft officials, whatever their politics.

Let me say a word about the De Havilland 4 and fix responsibility for the manufacture of machines that we have declared in our report were "flaming coffins." I am going to give you unimpeachable authority for the statement that they are rightly named. I quote from the chief aviator of the United States, who appeared before our committee. He had 26 victories to his credit and was given the cross and distinguished service medal by Gen. Patrick, who also appeared before our committee. I allude to Capt. Rickenbacker. He stood up there in the gallery after his return, and you gentlemen all paid homage to him, to a splendid soldier, the ace of aces, when he was there. Here is his statement:

From every side Fokkers were piquing upon the clumsy Liberty machines, which, with their criminally constructed fuel tanks, offered so easy a target to the incendiary bullets of the enemy that their unfortunate pilots called this boasted achievement of our aviation department their "flaming coffins." During that one brief flight over Grand Pre I saw three of these crude machines go down in flames, an American pilot and an American gunner in each "flaming coffin" dying this frightful and needless death.

Does it make any difference what I have done to which Homer Cummings objects, when you have Rickenbacker's judgment on "flaming coffins"? He says again:

The Germans \* \* \* had seen the spring months pass, and instead of viewing with alarm the huge fleet of 20,000 aeroplanes sweeping the skies clear of German Fokkers, they had complacently witnessed the Fokkers occupying the air back of our lines whenever they desired it, with never an American plane to oppose them.

The Germans were free to bomb American troops in the trenches, and, according to testimony of reputable witnesses before our committee, that is what they did repeatedly without an American plane to oppose them. And we had appropriated \$1,000,000,000 and over for airplanes to protect those boys.

Rickenbacker next speaks of the French Nieuports bought for our aviators by the aviation officials of this Government. Your boys were over there flying them; Gen. HULINGS's son was with them. My colleague, Mr. LAMPERT, had five sons in the war. Here is what they had, and I am later going to give you as good authority as Capt. Rickenbacker in support of that same estimate.

Capt. Rickenbacker says:

From the frequency of accidents to our Nieuport it may be wondered why we continued to use them. The answer is simple. We had no others we could use. The American air forces were in dire need of machines of all kinds. We were thankful to get any kind that would fly. The French had already discarded the Nieuport for the steadier, stronger Spad, and thus our Government was able to buy from the French a certain number of these out-of-date Nieuport machines for American pilots, or go without. Consequently our American pilots in France were compelled to venture out in Nieuports against more experienced pilots in more modern machines. None of us in France could understand what prevented our great country from furnishing machines equal to the best in the world.

Many a gallant life was lost to American aviation during those early months of 1918, the responsibility for which must lie heavily upon some guilty conscience.

That is the judgment of the first aviator of the United States. Now I read from the Senate subcommittee report.

I may speak of that as a Democratic report. No; I would rather say a fair report by a Democratic committee of the United States Senate, and if you will read our report you will find that we quote from it repeatedly. Here is what the Thomas committee says on this particular proposition of defective French machines sold to us for use of American flyers. It appears on page 10 of the Thomas report. It is not quoted in our report:

An Army officer recently at the front testified that the American troops are using many antiquated machines purchased from the French that were discarded by them a year and a half ago. They are using the Sopwith, one and one-half strutter, which has been declared unsafe by the French and British for observation work.

Our American aviators were using unsafe English and French obsolete machines and a few "flaming coffins" of American manufacture.

That may explain why three times as many of our aviators were lost and killed in battle as those of the Allies, according to the statement of Gen. Menoher, shown by our report. These aviators came from your families and from the families of hundreds of thousands of people in this country, and then in reply to this awful indictment Homer Cummings attacks me personally because I voted on one proposition or the other he did not approve, and only two of the six were correctly stated, it is farcical and shows Mr. Cummings fails to appreciate the seriousness of the facts disclosed. With him everything is believed to be political, but this comes from a Senate committee of which a majority are leading Democrats of the country. I do not believe that he can prevent a correct judgment in the mind of anyone who reads the report.

I wish now to read to you a letter which came to me yesterday just before I left my office. I read it on the way over to the House, as also I did another which came to-day. This letter is from an American aviator, a young lawyer, a Democrat in Lexington, Ky., and this is what he says:

LEXINGTON, KY., February 17, 1920.

HON. JAMES A. FREAR,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: I read with interest in the morning papers an account of your exposure of the mismanagement of our Air Service during the late war, and especially the portion of it regarding the "Great Liberty" planes, which were rightly named "flying coffins" by those on the front who were so unfortunate as to be assigned to fly them.

I volunteered at the beginning of the war, and after serving two months in an officers' training camp, threw away my chance for a commission in the cavalry and enlisted as a cadet in the Air Service, and was trained by the Royal Air Force in Canada, later flying a few months in Texas, and then again in England, before going out to the front in France, where I was a pilot on a "flying coffin," doing day bombing until November 5, 1918, when I was transferred to be a pilot on the French Spad machine. Having used machines of Canada, England, France, and the "Liberty," think that I am qualified to give an opinion on the merits of the "coffin," as I was discharged last July.

The Twentieth Aero Squadron lost 11 aviators out of 12 on September 26, 1918, on the "coffins." I personally saw five go down in one fight in flames. If you would ask the opinion of the boys who are left out of the Eleventh, Twentieth, and One hundred and sixty-sixth, the only three "Liberty" bombing squadrons on the front, you will

hear nothing but curses for the criminals that sent that machine with an unprotected gasoline tank to be used on the front. The aviators who were taken prisoner and returned from Germany after the war told me that the Huns ridiculed them for using such a death trap. No Frenchman, Englishman, or Hun would start over the lines with a DH-4 Liberty as we used. It was heralded over this country in the papers that the speed was 140 per hour, while we never secured one on the front that would go over 100, while if you placed bombs on it, as we did, 70 miles was the limit. You can figure your chance to fight a German machine making 140 and with a protected tank.

I have no grouse at anyone, but know that many of my friends were uselessly shot down in flames in France, and I have yet to find a friend of the "coffins" among the boys who used them and are the only ones qualified to speak, not some general in Paris surrounded by the many pleasures of that gay city. I am a Democrat, worked for Wilson before his nomination in 1912, voted for him in 1916, went to Washington to see him inaugurated, March, 1917, and went A. W. O. L. in France December 14, 1918, to see his triumphant entry into Paris, but some of his appointees have sure played havoc with the Air Service and sacrificed many lives.

If you need the addresses of the real aviators who used the "coffins" on the front, will take pleasure in sending them to you, and I am sure that they all appreciate your stand in the matter, also the Hon. WALTER W. MAGEE. Do not care to have my name used as yet, before I think it necessary.

Yours, very sincerely,

What think you, gentlemen, of that statement, coming from a Democrat who is unprejudiced? He saw 11 out of 12 American aviators fall at one time in one fight, 5 of them in "flaming coffins." Other witnesses have testified to the same general effect. Who was responsible for this? Mr. Cummings would say, "Oh, well, that was one of the accidents of war." Let us see if it was. Let me quote from Senator REED, one of the ablest Senators at the other end of the Capitol, when examining Mr. Ryan, who was then Director of Aircraft. Listen to this, please:

Senator REED. You know that the best and most experienced fliers, a number of them in this country, have testified before this committee that they regard the De Haviland machine as utterly unsafe, and that they would refuse to go up in it or send subordinates up in it?

Mr. RYAN. I understand that some have testified that they have refused to go up in it or let subordinates go up in it.

Senator REED. You propose to go on making the De Haviland 4 machines?

Mr. RYAN. Until we can put the De Haviland 9 into production.

Senator REED. Do you intend to do that regardless of any testimony that may be given by experienced fliers that the machine is utterly unsafe?

Mr. RYAN. I am not convinced that the burden of testimony of the fliers throughout the country is that the De Haviland 4 is an unsafe machine.

That is taken from the Thomas Senate hearings and quoted in our own hearings and in our report. Mr. Ryan knew during the war the character of machines he was furnishing American fliers. He did know. Senator REED compelled him to know what he should have known many months before.

I might add here that only one De Haviland 9 plane ever reached Europe, and that never got to the front.

Mr. Ryan continued manufacturing these "flaming coffins" until \$50,000,000 had been expended and wasted upon these utterly dangerous machines. Some one may say that Mr. Ryan was not the responsible man in power, that it was the Secretary of War. Then read from page 12 of our report where Senator New is quoted. Senator New says there, in the same Thomas committee hearings, that every man who appeared before their committee, every flier, said that the De Haviland 4 was an utterly unsafe machine. Many officers would not permit their men to fly in them. He was then examining the Secretary of War, Mr. Baker, and when he got through with his question in which he stated these facts, Mr. Baker said:

The subcommittee, of course, has a great advantage over me in that I have not been permitted to see any of the testimony the committee has taken, so that I do not know anything about this concurrence of opinion to which you refer.

That occurred in the Thomas committee, and later Secretary Baker testified as follows before our committee:

Mr. Ryan and I talked over the general question, \* \* \* and I approved we should not suspend making any machine we were then making, but we should go on and make it and get ready to make others.

And they did. They never got another American machine, except a handful—213 "flying coffins" for our aviators at the front, and we had 4,000 fliers there in Europe. Mr. Ryan complains because he is criticized in this report, and his method of getting revenge is to criticize me personally. I might point with equal right to the enormous profits, reaching many millions annually, which Mr. Ryan made out of the war when his Anaconda Copper Co. increased its profits over \$75,000,000 during the war, but that is beside this question of responsibility for the lives of American aviators who were protecting men in the trenches. If I could only tell you what influence has been brought to bear to whitewash in this report you might feel we are justified in speaking far stronger in condemnation of responsible officials.

You have got no whitewash, and you can not have from the majority of this committee. You have the facts as we believe

them to be—not political, not partisan. We have endeavored to give you those facts. You sent us unanimously to do the work, and we have made our report. There is a minority report, and I have no criticism to offer here. Everyone has a right to his own conclusions with regard to the testimony, but our report is as we find it. I had a son who was over there during the war, and he wrote a letter that I read to the Secretary of War without giving the authorship. He was at Chateau-Thierry, and he sent back word in his letter to me, "Send us more planes and still more planes." He said, "You do not know how disheartening it is to our boys; we have not any planes over here." When I read that to Secretary Baker, then before our committee, he said, "That is a touching and beautiful letter." But that did not meet the situation. We needed planes over there. One thousand million dollars were expended for planes, and we did not get them. And on a showing like that Mr. Cummings says, "You should not listen to Mr. FREAK. He voted against tabling the McLeMORE resolution in 1916 and against war." I did, with Mr. KITCHIN and Gen. SHERWOOD and scores of other men who are among the most trusted men in this House; but I have never dodged responsibility and have ever acted on my own judgment, without fear of criticism from men of the Cummings type.

Read the testimony, the sworn testimony, before our committee, that is all we ask of you. We say to you, gentlemen of the House, that the people back home who raised a billion dollars in money for airplanes, a million and more fathers and mothers who gave their boys, are entitled to know the facts. I have letters received this morning from aviators, and they all say that we have their indorsement in exposing those who are responsible for a needless tragedy. You are getting just exactly the facts as we believe them to be. That is all we desire to offer. We do not care to burnish them or to add anything to what appears here, but the plain testimony is offered, as it would be taken in any court of justice. This question is too great to be dismissed by ridicule or abuse of the committee. The people want the facts, and we have given them to you in the report as we believe them to be. Gentlemen, I thank you for this courtesy. [Applause.]

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. How much time did the gentleman yield back?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields back five minutes.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. STEVENSON]. [Applause.]

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Chairman, the Federal Reserve Board has recently raised discount rates to the following figures:

	Per cent.
Notes, 1 to 90 days, secured by certificates of indebtedness of the United States	4½
Notes, 1 to 90 days, secured by Liberty bonds and Victory bonds	5½
Bankers' acceptances	5
Commercial paper (all kinds)	6
Agricultural paper	6
Notes secured by War Finance Corporation bonds	7

This was done January 22, and was slightly modified on February 2. This action was greeted by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LUCE], member of the Banking and Currency Committee, on January 29 with joy, and he made the following statement, which was greeted with prolonged applause on the Republican side. He said:

A month ago they began what some of us wish could have been done before. They began raising the discount rate. This month they have raised it still further. Speed their action. Encourage them at every opportunity to put on the brakes to prevent this constant increase in rediscounting commercial paper, which is threatening us with so much peril. \* \* \* It is time for us to open our eyes, time for us to know that we are entering upon another great discussion of money, time for us to realize that we ought to understand whether we are going to pay our debt now or postpone its payment, whether we are going to deflate the currency and bring it back to where it was before the war, whether we are going to return the activities of Government to that stage which amply met the needs of the people but a few short years ago.

How does he propose to deflate the currency? He says reduce the Federal reserve notes issued, which he calls "flat money." Now, they are only issued on (a) commercial paper, (b) agricultural paper, and so forth (see sections 13, 14, and 16, Federal reserve act), and can not be issued "for the purpose of carrying or trading in stocks, bonds, and so forth, except bonds of the United States," section 13. Hence, to begin to contract Federal reserve notes unduly will at once contract manufacturing and other commercial operations and agricultural operations and thereby directly decrease the supply of necessities and increase the price.

The distinguished speaker ran over the financial history of the country, with more or less accuracy, and praised the order raising discount rates. Now, I desire to consider the wisdom of this highly praised order and will glance for a minute at the beginning of our modern financial history. I cite the per capita cir-

ulation at the beginning and end of the Civil War and, by decades, to date:

Year.	Population.	Per capita.
1860.....	31,000,000	13.85
1865.....	34,000,000	20.58
1870.....	38,000,000	17.51
1880.....	50,000,000	19.41
1890.....	62,000,000	22.82
1900.....	76,000,000	26.93
1910.....	90,000,000	34.33
1917.....	104,000,000	45.74
1920—Feb. 1.....	106,000,000	54.77

So in 1860 to 1865, in war, circulation increased \$6.73 on 13.85, or 49 per cent. In 1917 to 1920, in war, it increased \$9.03 on 45.74, or 19 per cent. In 1860 to 1865 coin decreased from \$235,000,000 to \$25,000,000 and bank notes and Treasury notes increased from \$207,000,000 to \$745,000,000, and of this national banks had out \$205,000,000, secured by 5 per cent gold reserve, and that left Treasury notes \$540,000,000, backed by nothing in the world but the fiat of the United States, and gold was at a premium of two and sometimes three to one. While to-day our currency runs equal with gold everywhere and there is security for every dollar of Federal reserve notes out, first, nearly 50 cents of gold in the reserve fund and the Treasury, and, second, the credit of the merchant or farmer, whose note is up to secure it, worth 100 cents on the dollar, and, third, the United States Government to back it. Why, then, compare the great financial system constructed and conserved by the present administration with the haphazard makeshift rigged up by the Republican Party and perpetuated for 50 years by them for the benefit of people who could, with a 5 per cent reserve and United States bonds on which they drew interest while using them for a basis for money, expand or contract the currency at their will? Who wants to return to the days of 1890, when there was 22.82 cents per capita circulation, when Kansas and Nebraska burned corn for fuel, and stock raisers could ship their stock and cattle to market and about realize the freight on them? I have seen cotton sell at 4 cents a pound for good lint in those days, and now the laborer gets 3 cents a pound for merely gathering it out of the fields. Evidently, though, the increase in the circulating medium is not responsible for the high price of necessary commodities, as they have gone up about 200 per cent on the average since April 1, 1917, while the circulating medium has increased only 19 per cent, and from January 1, 1920, to February 1, 1920, decreased \$1.12 per capita. Then the cry is made, as cited above, that it is the expansion of credits. Now, there are—

- (a) Credits for use in productive industries;
- (b) Credits for luxuries and extravagances; and
- (c) Credits for speculative purposes.

Consider industrial credits a minute. If you increase credit facilities for the farmer or manufacturer, you enable him to produce more and to take advantage of every improvement which tends to reduce the cost and increase the output and hence to make more produce and more goods for the market, and this is the first requisite to a reduction of the price. The trouble to-day is largely scarcity of necessities and scant production. Let the great credit institutions stand behind the farmer and the manufacturer and the transportation companies in their endeavor to feed and clothe the world and they will begin soon to show a reduction of cost to the consumer. No, sir; credit to the industrial classes should never be contracted while the walls of starving, naked, destitute people are ascending to Heaven in a pitiful plea for aid. A manufacturer has a call for cloth. He goes to the market for cotton and locates 1,000 bales suitable for his purpose. He tells his banker, "I want \$200,000 for six months to buy cotton for manufacture." The banker says, "No; bank credits are too much expanded; I can not let you expand them any more." Do not you hear the manufacturer say to that man, "Why, people are freezing and dying for clothing; my operatives, 1,000 of them, are ready and eager to work. If you do not let me have the cash to buy the raw material, the mill must stop, and the horrors of unemployed, starving population will be transferred from Europe to my door and your door. I must have the money?"

And that is the actual condition that exists at some places right now in regard to raw products, as I shall show presently. And the banker then relents a little and says, "Well, I will let you have half of it at a higher rate. We are warned that we must contract our loans and restrict bank credits." The manufacturer, to save the situation, accepts half what he needs and pays a higher rate of interest for it, and can not buy enough

cotton to go on advantageously, and, necessarily, adds the higher rate of interest and additional cost to the price of his goods, and there goes another rise in the cost of living.

If he got the thousand bales of cotton promptly the \$200,000 would go to probably 10 farmers, and they would put it in bank and it would merely distribute the funds from the large city bank to the country banks, who would immediately redeposit it in the city bank or pay off rediscouunts, and no one could say there was inflation there. The factory would run, the firemen and engineers, the spinners and weavers, the loom fixers and room bosses would all be paid remunerative wages and goods would be turned out and sold and the \$200,000 returned to the bank that loaned it. Can such a transaction be called inflation of bank credits? True, there is a loan placed to the manufacturer's credit in exchange for his note, which is probably rediscounted at the Federal reserve bank, but that credit is drawn in favor of 10 farmers who have the cotton to sell and is by them placed with their banks, and you say there is a \$200,000 increase in bank deposits. Possibly so; but more than likely those farmers owe notes that are up with the Federal reserve bank for money to make the cotton; they retire their notes and the Federal reserve bank then holds the manufacturer's paper instead of theirs, and a commodity worth the money represents it in the manufacturer's hands. Can that be an injurious inflation of credits?

The raw material has gone into the hands of the man who can convert it into cloth necessary for the needs of the world, and when converted it goes to the relief of the people and provides work for the men who work in the factories, and they should be encouraged to buy and manufacture same to the limit of their capacity.

Mr. HUSTED. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEVENSON. I can not yield at the present time.

The same applies to the wheat and corn growers and millers of the West and the stock and cattle men and their stockyard connections. Is it possible that raising the price of money on them and restricting their operations can decrease the cost of living? Will it not increase it? I would say put the price of discounts for productive pursuits, for the farmer, the dairyman, the stock and cattle men, the mining of coal and iron, the manufacture of all the necessities of life, and of business to the lowest possible figure. Say to them, "Capital is ready for you; go to work and let the hum of your industries cheer a desperate and starving world." To that call industry will respond and the goods will be produced which will satisfy the world and competition will bring down the high cost. You can not get goods cheaper by making it cost more to produce them, and charging a higher rate for money and making working capital harder to get will increase the cost and decrease the output. Then what can the banking system do? It can put a prohibitive rate on loans to the man who wants it to finance gambling transactions, either on exchanges or in lands or oil-well ventures or any other gambling ventures. The speculator is easily identified. He neither produces anything himself nor does he finance anybody else to produce. He bets on a stock or piece of land or oil prospect or gold prospect, selling for more to-morrow than he contracts to pay for it to-day; he takes an option on it for \$1,000 to-day, expecting to sell it for \$2,000 to-morrow. He is nonproductive, and until we get enough produced to relieve the wants of the world the rate of discount to him should be prohibitive. The Federal reserve act prohibits the rediscount of his paper except when secured by United States bonds, but when so secured, under the order referred to, he gets a preferential rate. Again, the rates should be put up on loans for extravagances. Many people are borrowing money to indulge in things of which they do not stand in need, and thereby are competing with people who need such things and stimulating production in excess of the country's needs of certain articles and diverting labor and energy from needed production to needless production, leaving the world short of the things most needed. Rates should be prohibitive to people for such purposes. The automobile business is an instance—many people need them badly; many people do not need them at all, but borrow money not only to buy them but to operate them. The B. F. Goodrich Tire Co. has had its statistician to get approximately the number in use in the United States in 1919, and it is 7,555,260, an increase over 1918 of 1,531,664. If these machines cost on the average about \$1,000—and that is exceedingly conservative—we have \$7,555,260,000 that they cost, or one-third of the entire cost to the United States of the late war. Half of them were needed; and if only half had been bought, they could have been bought cheaper and a lot of high-priced labor engaged in making and repairing the other half could be in other pursuits making other necessary things. I protest, therefore, against contraction of loans and of the cur-

reney as against the producers of this country. As to them, the most liberal policy consistent with safety should be pursued and the hand of the usurer should be kept off the neck of industry, but the speculator and the wastrel should find the door of credit closed to them until the world has been supplied with the necessities of life and until production has become so great that competition in the markets has brought prices to a reasonable level. If the gentleman from Massachusetts really means that he wants the currency contracted to its pre-war basis and commercial credits contracted, does he speak for his party, who applauded the sentiment expressed, and does he desire to slow down production and increase the cost and demoralize industry?

I do not believe that the Federal reserve bank intends to do so, but if they do, by their order, destroy the power to produce, along with the power to waste, and cripple the power to transform into useful and necessary goods the raw material that is produced, as well as cripple the speculator in his promotions, then they are pursuing a policy of ruin to legitimate industry that will react on the system as sure as day follows night. The prospective use of the proceeds of paper should determine the rate of discount and not the form of the collateral, assuming that all the collateral accepted is good. This is recognized by the Federal reserve act. See pages 27, 28, and 33. The speculator may, and probably will, have bonds to put up and get his money cheaper than the farmer and manufacturer. You may applaud the plea for contraction of credits for productive industry now, but the plain people who are being asked to increase production will be heard from as a result and in no uncertain terms. The distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts also complains that bank deposits have increased \$786,000,000 in two months and amounted to \$17,000,000,000 on November 1, 1919. About this he says:

Why, sir, the agencies of the Treasury Department itself do not understand what is happening. Let me call the attention of my friend from Arkansas [Mr. Winco] to another publication which, perchance, he throws into the wastebasket. It is a bulletin from the Comptroller of the Currency. The copy in my hand came early in the week. In it he boasts, as he has boasted month after month all winter, of the inflation of the bank deposits, the increase in the things that do the work of money, that are adding to our danger.

The first thing I wish my Democratic friends to do is to wake up their own administration and have the Comptroller of the Currency send out this news with grief rather than with joy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STEVENSON. May I have five minutes more?

Mr. Sisson. I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BAER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEVENSON. I can not; I have not the time.

Why announce it with grief? Has it not been recognized that a people's thrift and prosperity are measured by their bank deposits? Does the gentleman advocate a campaign to reduce bank deposits? Does he approve of a drive to educate people back to the "coffee pot and stocking" bank? The worst disaster that could befall the Nation would be shaking the confidence of depositors in the banks and the withdrawal of deposits. The gentleman is the Republican representative of the great State of Massachusetts on the Banking and Currency Committee and, I presume, represents the New England idea of finance. Does his party intend to wage war on prosperity and attempt to decrease bank deposits? If it succeeds, another "Black Friday" is in store both for it and the Nation. It is true that deposits in national banks have increased from 1913, when they were \$7,948,000,000, to \$17,000,000,000—an increase of about 140 per cent, and the banking power of the country, as represented by capital, surplus, deposits, and circulation of all banks, as of June 30, 1919, was \$45,756,000,000, an increase over the year before of \$6,673,000,000. This makes the present banking power of the United States nine times what it was in 1890, 30 years ago, and three times the total banking power of the world for that year. But it is caused by the increased amounts which the products of this country bring and the spirit of thrift and banking enterprise developed in the last decade. Wheat has increased so that a farmer selling 1,000 bushels now gets about \$2,500 for it, whereas in 1913 he got about \$800. Corn has increased so that to-day 1,000 bushels brings about \$1,350, whereas it brought about \$550 in 1913. One thousand bales of cotton now brings about \$200,000, whereas in 1913 it was bringing \$60,000. Necessarily the agricultural countries have prospered and shown good sense by placing their money in bank, where it will finance the development of the limitless resources of the great agricultural sections. It has made them inde-

pendent of the great money centers of the Northeast and makes the future of the South and West bright with promise. Does the gentleman's party desire to replace the hands on those great sections by destroying their bank balances, decentralizing their cooperative efforts to finance themselves and make them resume their tributary position financially to those who have many dollars and wish to restore the good old days when a dollar will buy two dollars' worth, when corn sells at 50 cents, wheat at 80 cents, and cotton at 10 cents? If this is not its purpose, why does its representative on the Banking and Currency Committee come out to bring back the conditions existing "before the war"? If he does not mean that, and if the Republican Party, especially of the East, does not mean that, why these tears over the bank deposits, testifying in unanswerable terms as to the prosperity and thrift of the great producing sections? My answer to the wail and this call to the mourner's bench is that the farmers are too well satisfied with their bank accounts and too happy in their lately acquired independence to weep, and are too busy trying to produce more crops to relieve want and destitution and further swell their bank accounts to turn aside to listen to the exhortations of this prophet of evil, and be by him persuaded to tear down this splendid financial structure reared by those who understand their needs and desire to serve them. The reason for this attack and the New England attitude on the bank deposits of this country and the banking resources may be found in the fact that, while 20 years ago New England and the Eastern States, comprising 6 per cent of the continental United States, had 60 per cent of the resources of all the national banks; but since that time, and especially since the organization of the Federal reserve bank, the power has so shifted that the resources of the national banks of that territory are now only 47 per cent of the total, and while they have increased enormously in that territory, the increase in the South and West and the Pacific coast States has been so phenomenal that they have largely become independent of the New England and eastern control. The Western States have gained in banking resources 500 per cent; the Pacific States have gained 1,340 per cent in their resources; and the Southern States, including Oklahoma, have gained 889 per cent. The national banks of my own State of South Carolina have gained 1,343 per cent in their resources. All of which spells not disaster but prosperity and financial independence. [Applause.] I append a statement of the Comptroller of the Currency, dated January 30, 1920, which is exceedingly interesting as throwing a light upon the anxiety of New England because the banking resources of the country are making such remarkable progress:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,  
COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY,  
Washington, January 30, 1920.

WIDER DIFFUSION OF THE COUNTRY'S WEALTH AND CREDIT—ASTONISHING PROGRESS OF NATIONAL BANKING POWER IN 20 YEARS—GROWTH OF 1,000 PER CENT OR MORE IN EACH OF 16 STATES—IN PACIFIC STATES BANKS' ASSETS ADVANCE 1,340 PER CENT; OR \$1,620,177,000—OUR NATIONAL BANK RESOURCES INCREASE FROM FOUR AND ONE-HALF TO TWENTY-TWO AND ONE-HALF BILLION DOLLARS IN 20 YEARS.

A geographical analysis of the November 17, 1919, returns of the national banks of the country, and a comparison of the present resources of these banks with their resources just 20 years before, or, say, on September 7, 1899, not only furnishes convincing evidence of the stupendous and unprecedented growth of this country's banking power, but the comparison is particularly significant in another respect, for it emphasizes the widespread distribution of the country's wealth and the decentralization of its banking resources.

Twenty years ago the banking power of the country was mainly concentrated in the East, and the national banks in the New England and Eastern States, comprising 6 per cent of the territory of the continental United States, held about 60, or, to be exact, 59.87 per cent, of the total resources of all the national banks of the country. Since that time the resources of the national banks in the New England and Eastern States have increased \$7,719,937,000, or 277 per cent; but the proportion of the national bank resources in those States to the resources of all national banks is now 46.78 per cent of the total instead of 60 per cent.

#### BIG GROWTH IN THE MIDDLE WEST.

In September, 1899, the proportion of the total resources of all national banks in the Middle Western States was 25.64 per cent. Since then the resources of these banks have increased \$4,333,390,000, or 363 per cent. The proportion of their resources to the resources of all national banks is now 24.62 per cent.

#### HUGE INCREASE, BOTH ACTUAL AND COMPARATIVE, IN THE SOUTH.

In 1899 the total resources of all the national banks in 14 Southern States, including Oklahoma, were \$348,554,000, or 7.50 per cent of the total resources of all the national banks. Since that time the resources of the national banks in these States have increased \$3,097,707,000, or 889 per cent, and the proportion of resources now held in these Southern States is 15.35 per cent, against, as above shown, 7.50 per cent 20 years ago, the proportion having more than doubled.

#### WESTERN STATES GAIN 500 PER CENT.

In 1899 the national banks of eight Western States, including the Dakotas, Nebraska, Kansas, Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, and New Mexico, had resources of \$204,733,000. Since that time the resources of the national banks in those States have increased \$1,025,668,000, or 500 per cent. Twenty years ago these banks held 4.40 per cent of

the total resources of all banks. The percentage to-day in the same States is 5.48 per cent of the whole.

#### GREAT STRIDES ON THE PACIFIC COAST.

The resources of the national banks in the Pacific States, including California, Washington, Oregon, Idaho, Utah, Nevada, Arizona, and Alaska, in September, 1899, amounted to \$120,905,000. Since then the increase in resources in these States has been \$1,620,177,000, or 1,340 per cent. The proportion of the total resources of all national banks which the national banks in the Pacific States held in 1899 was 2.60 per cent. To-day these banks hold 7.76 per cent of the total resources of all national banks of the country.

In every State in the Union save one the increase in resources of the national banks since 1899 has amounted to more than 100 per cent, the exception being the State of Rhode Island, where the increase in 20 years was only 21.93 per cent; but, although the resources of the national banks in Rhode Island actually declined 15 per cent between 1899 and 1913, they have in that State, in the six years since 1913, when the Federal reserve law was passed, increased 44 per cent.

#### LEADERS IN PERCENTAGE GAINS.

The States whose national banks have shown an increase since 1899 of 1,000 per cent or more are, in the order given: Oklahoma, 6,537 per cent, or \$357,722,000; Nevada, 3,275 per cent, or \$17,423,000; Arkansas, 1,700 per cent, or \$79,116,000; Idaho, 1,691 per cent, or \$79,486,000; California, 1,685 per cent, or \$1,000,214,000; South Carolina, 1,343 per cent, or \$139,359,000; North Carolina, 1,255 per cent, or \$171,402,000; North Dakota, 1,250 per cent, or \$96,627,000; Wyoming, 1,237 per cent, or \$55,874,000; South Dakota, 1,234 per cent, or \$103,732,000; Virginia, 1,177 per cent, or \$396,554,000; Florida, 1,174 per cent, or \$102,736,000; Mississippi, 1,125 per cent, or \$56,018,000; Georgia, 1,119 per cent, or \$196,953,000; Arizona, 1,028 per cent, or \$29,001,000; and Texas, 1,013 per cent, or \$869,611,000.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I shall devote the time allowed me in this debate to a very abridged discussion of the railroad bill upon which we are to vote to-morrow. I want to call the attention of the country to the fact that within the last few months there have been housed within the city of Washington two of the greatest, most dangerous, and pernicious lobbies ever known in the history of this country, one the railroad lobby, the unprecedented lobby maintained here by the railroad corporate interests in their behalf, and the other the lobby, likewise unprecedented, maintained here in behalf of the railroad employees under the direction and manipulation of Samuel Gompers. I am sorry to say that during all of these months, while the capacity of the leading hotels, and especially of the New Willard and the Raleigh, have been taxed to the utmost limits to take care of the personnel of these two big lobbies—one the railroad lobby, the other the brotherhood's lobby—there has not been here in the city of Washington one single official or one single individual to speak for the people of the United States. Who has a greater interest in this bill than the people of the United States? Is not their interest most involved? Who appears for the people? It is in behalf of all the people that I rise to make some observations. The guaranties assured railroads in this bill are out of all proportion. The guaranties of this bill are beyond what the railroad corporate interests justly deserve, and yet they come and say that Congress is responsible for the conditions which call for such guaranties; that Congress took their properties away from them forcibly, and without their consent permitted the Director General to increase their wage pay roll over \$900,000,000 annually. They say that while we have had charge of the railroads one man has been able to increase their liabilities, by one, two, and three scratches of the pen, of nearly a billion of dollars.

The railroad owners tell us that by reason of the increased wages alone, allowed the four great brotherhoods during the war, concerning which the owners had no voice whatever, their operating expenses were thereby increased over \$900,000,000 annually, for which they claim the employees are alone responsible. These owners claim that inasmuch as the Government permitted the employees to increase such expenses \$900,000,000 the Government ought to assume full responsibility for its own action by making the railroads whole because of it.

And we are forced to admit that the railroad owners in this respect told the truth, for it is a fact that while our Government was engaged in a world war, the result of which involved the peace and happiness of all civilization, and when the slightest restriction of the full capacity of our combined railroad traffic menaced the successful conclusion of the war, upon which not only the United States but all of our civilized allies depended, these railroad brotherhoods came to their Government with deadlier threats and weapons than used by highwaymen and to Mr. McAdoo said, "If you do not pay us \$754,000,000 in cash we will tie up every road in the land," and that McAdoo, by a mere scratch of the pen, was forced to hand over the cash—\$754,000,000—that came not out of their pockets, but came out of the pockets of all the people. That is an annual increase that must be made good each year. It is a fact that it did not stop there, but that these same highwaymen leaders, with a like threat, the threat of absolute destruction, if you please, said to

Mr. Hines, "Give us \$67,000,000 more in cold cash. If you do not do it, it means death to this Nation and its institutions." And Mr. Hines, by a mere scratch of the pen, was forced to give them the \$67,000,000 in cold cash. And it is a fact these organized union leaders again forced Mr. Hines upon demand to give them more millions as a third raise during the war, and they are still demanding another, and they say in this bill, which has been drawn largely in their behalf, that these raises shall stand, as it provides that not a single change in the salaries shall occur prior to September 1, 1920. These are the conditions which the corporate interests say the union employees are responsible for and made necessary such guaranties in order to do justice to the people who own their bonds. But everything considered, I am of the opinion that no such guaranties as are contained in this bill should be granted, and that much more than is just and right has been done for the railroads, and if I had my way I would make many changes in the bill.

But, on the other hand, much more than is just and right has been done for the employees. It is the poor, suffering public whose rights have been ignored and not protected in this bill. I would that the public could have been represented in its making. But very unfortunately no lobby appeared for the public. The bill-paying "Jones" did not seek an audience. So full of clamor and insistence was the railroad lobby and the brotherhoods-Gompers union lobby that I am much afraid the suffering public was wholly forgotten.

In the past Congress and Washington have seen some remarkable Republican caucuses. We have had in Congress during its past history some very remarkable Democratic caucuses, if you please. But never until last night, in the whole history of this Congress and the Nation, have we ever had before what is known strictly as a Gompers caucus of Congressmen, if you please. Why, yesterday every Congressman, Republican or Democrat, who voted for what is known as the Anderson amendment had his office rung up, and his secretary was told that the Congressman should appear that night in the House caucus room, as Mr. Gompers was going to address the Members—not the ones who voted against the Anderson amendment; they were not so honored. Yesterday's newspapers told us that Mr. Gompers would give us his ultimatum on the railroad bill. But not a single Democrat and not a single Republican who voted against the Anderson amendment, now commonly called "the organized-labor amendment," was invited to this caucus. Blood was put on his door and he was skipped.

Congressmen who disobeyed Mr. Gompers and voted against the Anderson amendment did not receive this summons and they were not so honored, but the ones who voted for the Anderson amendment, an amendment which we know was just exactly what Mr. Gompers and his leaders wanted in the way of legislation, they were all told to be there without fail last night.

And the most remarkable thing about this Gompers-congressional caucus was that when telephoning the summons to Members yesterday, if they happened to be Republicans, they were then told that the affair was going to be a Republican caucus, while if they happened to be Democrats they were told—at least, a number of them—that it was to be a Democratic caucus, because when that question was raised last night in the caucus—I was not there, but some of my Gompers friends told me—several Congressmen stood up who are Democrats and said that they had been informed it was to be a Democratic caucus and a number of Republican Congressmen stood up and said that they were told that it was to be a Republican caucus. A caucus for what? To hear Mr. Gompers deliver his final orders and tell Congressmen what they should do in respect to the railroad bill when it is voted on Saturday.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BLANTON. I am sorry, but I have only 10 minutes, and I could easily use an hour on this great subject, if I had it. I hope the gentleman will not consider me discourteous for refusing to yield.

This dictator of legislation, Mr. Gompers, told you last night that he wanted you to vote against this bill and kill it. Why does he not like it? The conferees obeyed his mandate and eliminated the antistrike provision. The bill is most liberal in its terms for all employees, with no harsh provisions against them.

Mr. Gompers says he does not like this bill because it does not tote fair with the public. All of a sudden he is very much interested in the public. He does not like the labor section. Do you know why he does not like the labor section? It is simply because that in a mild way the labor section makes a stab at protecting the interests of the public, but it does not go far enough. He certainly could criticize it in the interest of the public, if he really had the public's interest at heart. He would

then be compelled to ask that the decision of the labor board be made worth something, after spending much public money to get a decision. The labor section says there shall be a tribunal. The labor section says there shall be a tribunal established to arbitrate differences; that upon this tribunal three men are to be selected who are nominated by the corporate railroad interests, three men are to be selected who are nominated by the employees themselves, and three men are to be selected on behalf of the public. It is the first time that the public has ever been given even a show-in on the question. And Mr. Gompers objects to that. He is objecting to the labor section because the public has been given representation thereon. These nine men will get \$10,000 a year each out of the people's money. But it does not go far enough, because their decision can be wholly disregarded by Mr. Gompers and the brotherhoods, if they do not like it, and we know what Mr. Gompers will do when he does not like a decision, because he has frankly told Congress that if it passes a law which he and his unions do not like they will not obey such a law, but will wholly disregard it.

The decision of this labor board, to be worth anything, should be one that could be enforced in the interest of the public, and not one to be obeyed or not by the employees, as they will. The railroad company must obey.

You notice in this bill, prepared by the conferees, that every time the railroad is told it must do so-and-so there is a penalty attached to it, but no penalty is ever attached to anything the employee must or must not do. It is left optional with such employees as to whether or not they want to obey the decision of this board.

Mr. Gompers met the Members of Congress in the House Office Building, in the House caucus room. Who authorized it? I went to the Speaker yesterday to see if he authorized it. He did not. There are three men only who have charge of this House Office Building—the Speaker, the ex-Speaker, and Mr. BACHARACH, of New Jersey. Mr. BACHARACH told me yesterday he did not authorize it. Who authorized it? I am informed that the ex-Speaker did not authorize it. But when Mr. Gompers wants a meeting, no authority is necessary. How many men obeyed that summons? How many men are going to obey the ultimatum of Mr. Gompers, who tells you to your face and through the press that if you do not obey the summons and his orders to vote against this bill he is going to put you out of Congress and elect somebody to take your place? Has he got you scared? He has not scared me. He has not made me flinch. Is he going to make you flinch to-morrow? If there are sections in this bill which ought to be amended, why does not Mr. Gompers ask that they be properly amended? Why does he ask to kill the whole bill? And why do not we properly amend the bill? It does need amending. Why should it be killed? All of us agree that it is absolutely necessary to return the roads to their owners. Why, if we kept them these employees would hold us up every month in the year.

I say the time has come when the railroads of this country must be turned back to their owners. [Applause.] Why, if we kept them it would be a constant burden upon the people. We would be held up every three months in the year. We must turn them back. I am going to vote to turn them back. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANKFORD].

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Chairman, there are now pending for consideration by this Congress bills for two canals affecting my district in Georgia.

One of the proposed canals—the St. Marys-St. Marks—begins at Cumberland Sound on the Atlantic Ocean near St. Marys, in my district, proceeds along the border of Camden and Charlton Counties, through the Okefenokee Swamp, possibly touching the counties of Ware and Clinch in the Okefenokee Swamp, and thence into Florida to the Gulf of Mexico.

The other canal—the Altamaha-Apalachicola Canal—would use the harbor at Brunswick, Ga., in my district, as the Atlantic terminal and would proceed along the Altamaha and Ocmulgee Rivers, bordering on the following counties in my district, to wit: Glynn, Wayne, Appling, Jeff Davis, Coffee, and across near Cordele to Flint River, and down Flint to Apalachicola River and to the Gulf. This canal would be in close touch with every

county in my district and within easy access by motor truck and railroad with every community in the eleventh district.

The Altamaha-Apalachicola Canal would help not only my district but would touch about 25 south Georgia counties, and would do more to improve all of south Georgia than has ever been done by any improvement.

The St. Marys-St. Marks Canal, if dug on a sea-level basis, would also be the financial salvation of my district, and while it would not touch near so much of my district as the other canal, yet it could be reached easily by everybody by motor trucks and rail service.

But, Mr. Chairman, my heart is set on legislation looking to the drainage of the Okefenokee Swamp and the level wet lands of south Georgia which are near the Okefenokee and which make up a large part of my district, and I am now working on a bill along this line.

A sea-level canal through the Okefenokee would drain the swamp and would drain thousands of square miles of good land in the counties of Camden, Charlton, Wayne, Pierce, Ware, Atkinson, Clinch, Echols, and other counties in my district where live some of the best people God's sun ever shone on.

I would be oh, so happy, if a sea-level canal were built through the Okefenokee. It would mean so much for not only the whole Nation but especially for the people of my district and would mean everything for the people of the low-level lands. I am for a sea-level canal through the Okefenokee first, last, and all the time. When a barefoot plowboy in Clinch County there was implanted in me the ever-present burning desire to be of service to the good people of not only the county of Clinch, where I first saw the light, but to all the good people who make their living by the sweat of their brow, and I will never be untrue to that heartfelt desire.

One of the greatest desires of my life has been to be helpful in some way in the drainage of south Georgia. I shall do everything I can here in Congress to secure the drainage of the lowlands of that section. The St. Marys-St. Marks sea-level canal would in a large measure accomplish the drainage of the Okefenokee and the adjoining level lands, and it is not in the minds of men to understand the good that would result. I would be one of the happiest of men if I could help in the construction of a sea-level canal through the Okefenokee Swamp and adjacent wet lands. But it is suggested that if a sea-level canal can not be built, then a lock canal should be built.

A lock canal means to dam the Okefenokee Swamp and St. Marys and Suwanee Rivers and hold the water in the Okefenokee and back the water up the Suwannee Creek and other creeks flowing into the Okefenokee and these rivers, and means to flood the thousands of square miles of land which I have been praying to get drained.

A lock canal means to make the wet lands of south Georgia still wetter and means good-by to all hopes of drainage. It means for thousands of people in a half dozen counties around the Okefenokee Swamp to move away from their little water-flooded and ruined homes. It means that the fields where I plowed shall be left vacant and bare and that my kin people and other hundreds of people that I love as I love my life shall sacrifice their all. It means that I will never stand for it.

I may be untrue to myself, but I never will knowingly be untrue to the great mass of men and women who toil and whom I love as I love my own life.

Mr. Chairman, I am extremely anxious for a sea-level canal through the Okefenokee. It would be valuable to the Nation and would drain the lands I want drained so much. But if a lock canal is to be built then I shall object to its going through the Okefenokee Swamp unless the Government pays the people of the half-dozen or more counties to be injured full value for the lands to be flooded. I want the canal, but I also want drainage. If I can get the canal and drainage, then good. If the canal kills the possibility of drainage, then I want drainage and favor a barge lock canal up the Altamaha and Ocmulgee Rivers and across to the Flint and down to the Gulf.

This canal will not injure any large tract of land. The Altamaha and Ocmulgee are navigable now and so are the Flint and Apalachicola Rivers. It will be necessary to deepen these in some places and possibly put in locks at each end of the canal across from the Ocmulgee to the Flint. This canal would be about 25 miles long through the hilly section of Georgia and would probably follow other streams most of the way and would not injure the hilly land close by.

Suppose we can not get a sea-level St. Marys-St. Marks Canal. Then is it not best to build a barge lock canal along the other route?

It would mean much for Brunswick. It would put half a dozen counties in my district on one of the largest inland water-

ways in the Nation. It would put a great inland waterway through the very heart of south Georgia. With good roads and trucks the people of all my district could carry their cotton and freight to cheap water transportation in two or three hours. Freight rates would be cheaper in my entire district, and every man, woman, and child in my district and in Georgia would be benefited.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to be misunderstood. I am for the St. Marys-St. Marks Canal on a sea-level basis. But if a lock canal must be built, if any at all, then I am for the Altamaha-Apalachicola Canal. If I know myself, I am for the thing which is best for the greatest number of the people of my district and Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I pray for guidance that I may never prove false to the people whom I represent. I was reared among them, and I shall never cast a vote nor take a position which I do not honestly believe is for their interest. If I take a wrong stand, and I probably will some time, as all men do, then it shall be an error of a mind seeking for the light and not of my heart.

In the cabins and in the cottages and in the larger homes by the roadside, among the pine trees in my district, lives the farmer surrounded by his toil-worn wife and little flock. "God grant that no act or vote of mine may ever add to the burdens which they now bear, and that in every word I utter and every vote I cast while I stand as their representative on this floor I may have no higher motive and no loftier aim than to promote their best interest and to alleviate their condition. Then when I return to my home I can look them in the face and say of a truth, 'Thy people are my people, thy country is my country, thy God is my God.'"

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR].

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I merely want to ask permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, the same permission, practically, that I asked for heretofore. I believe the objection made at that time has been withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Colorado asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields back nine minutes.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUDDLESTON].

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, I address myself to the railroad legislation which now pends before the House by the report of the conferees on the Esch and Cummins bills and which are to be acted on to-morrow.

So many misstatements have been made as to the increases of wages given employees of railroads under Federal control that it is in order to say that the increase for all railroad employees averages less than 50 per cent. The largest increases have been given to the poorest-paid employees. Firemen receive only 40 per cent increase; engineers, 27 per cent; and conductors, 18 per cent; and, as I have said, the average increase for all employees of every kind and character—transportation, shop, and otherwise—is under 50 per cent. In the meantime the increase in the cost of living to these men is not less than 80 per cent. The fact yet remains that men who work for railroads have received a smaller increase in wages since 1914 than any other class of labor outside of Federal employees. So much for that matter.

"MISSHAPEN, BENT, BORN OUT OF TIME."

The conferees have made their report. The mountain has labored and brought forth not a squeaking, harmless, and ridiculous mouse but a hideous monster. The Cummins and Esch bills, ugly and forbidding as both were, have been married, and the result of this unholy union is the conference report—a Frankenstein, which is in the way of devouring the American people. "A creature swart, misshapen, bent, born out of time," is the conference report on the railroad legislation.

I do not make partisan speeches on this floor, and what I say now is not for partisan advantage. But I can not keep from feeling a deep satisfaction that my side—the Democratic side—is not responsible for this legislation. Whatever stigma is due for this legislation belongs to the Republicans and to the Republican Party, which is in control of both branches of Congress. Congress has done a good deal of meanness in the last two or three years. Some little of that maybe I participated in. The Democrats have been bad. The only thing that saves them is the fact that the Republicans have been worse, for it is under their instigation and under their leadership and by compromises with them that we have done the mean things

that we have committed. It has been because we abandoned our own precedents and traditions and went over to those of the other side.

#### A REPUBLICAN MEASURE.

But in this railroad legislation we are not guilty. The Esch bill passed the House by a majority of only 45. A change of 23 votes would have defeated it. On the vote upon the Esch bill the yeas were 205, of which there were—Republicans 175, Democrats 30. The nays were 160—Republicans 22, Democrats 136.

I refer to this, gentlemen of the Republican side of the aisle, not for party advantage, because I love more than the interests of my party the welfare of my country, and I do not want to see my party get an advantage which comes at the expense of the public welfare. [Applause.] But I refer you to this to warn you of the responsibility that you are taking, a responsibility which you do not divide with us, a responsibility which is yours exclusively. I warn you that this is a Republican measure and that the damnation that will follow its passage into law will be visited upon you.

I do not claim to be a political prophet, but let me venture in my modest way to say this: In my judgment if this measure becomes a law in the form in which it is reported by the conferees, or substantially in that form, it will defeat any man or any party that supports it if the people find out the wrong that has been done them. Nothing can save him but ignorance on the part of his constituents.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. The gentleman will please excuse me. I have not the time. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman, but the gentleman must realize what an immense subject this is.

#### THE PEOPLE WILL PUNISH.

The only thing that can save the advocates of this measure is that they may not "be found out." The people are forgiving, and perhaps after a few years they may forgive the wrong. But if the consequences and nature of this bill are realized before next November, then you might well to-day repeat the language of the gladiator and look up at the galleries and the powerful financial interests there who have dictated this legislation and say, "Caesar, men about to die salute you."

I do not gloat over your situation. I do not gloat, I merely give you warning. I beg of you, my friends, I beg you to examine this bill, to study and see its iniquities, and to serve first your country and then yourselves by defeating it.

Mr. LAYTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I hope the gentleman will not ask me to yield. I would be glad to yield to him if I had the time.

When the people of this country realize that you have passed a measure which necessitates an increase in railroad rates of from 25 to 40 per cent above present rates; when they realize that the Government guarantees and underwrites the profits of the railroad owners and that you have put your people at home behind it—your people in New York and in Ohio—your constituents and their faith and credit behind this guaranty—when they realize that you have gone into the Treasury of the United States and taken therefrom \$300,000,000 plus of the people's money and turned it over to the railroads for their rehabilitation and to restore their credit; when the people realize that you have taken another \$200,000,000 of the people's funds for the purpose of winding up the Railroad Administration, so that we may extend credit to the roads for what they owe us for 10 years, and pay them cash all that we owe the railroads; when they realize that, my friends, and many other iniquities which, if I had the time, I could point out in this bill, they will wreak vengeance upon you.

When the 2,000,000 railroad employees find out what you are trying to do to them upon the demand of reactionary railroad financiers, woe unto you.

#### LEGISLATION DEMANDED BY SELFISH INTERESTS.

I do not say this for any purpose other than to urge you not to allow anybody to force you into supporting this measure under the pretense that it is necessary for the occasion. I call your attention, my friends, to the fact that the people of this country are not asking for this legislation, and that they have no need for it for their interest or protection. Neither are the railroad employees asking for it.

The people, so far as they are informed as to its details, are against the legislation, and do not want it. They have been deceived by a false propaganda into believing that Government control has been a failure. They only want to get rid of the railroads. They say, "Turn the railroads back." That is all the people say—"Turn them back in the same condition as when we took them over."

The railroad employees do not want it. Who is it that wants the legislation? The only interests that want this legislation—the selfish interests that are demanding it—are the railroad owners, their associates and bankers, their parasites, and those who are back of them and who stand with them because of class interests and prejudices.

Bear this in mind: The people do not need any additional law. The railroad-control act authorizes the return of the roads to their owners. All the President has got to do is to hand them back, and that will end it. But this legislation is for the railroad stockholders' protection; it is to put them on their feet, so that they can take their own property back—that is why it is being demanded, and that is why you are being asked to pass this measure. We are being asked to finance the roads for their owners' benefit and to guarantee their profits; that is the sole purpose of this legislation.

We took the railroads over; we took them under a law which authorized us to turn them back at the will of the President. The President has exercised that will. According to the law as it now stands, these railroads go back on the 1st day of March, and no legislation for the protection of the people and none for the protection of the railroad employees is required for that purpose. But the railroads think they need protection; they demand help. They are the ones that are demanding that you shall take action to protect them.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I can not yield. I have just declined to yield to other gentlemen, and I can not make an exception of the gentleman from Texas.

#### NO NEED FOR HASTY LEGISLATION.

Now, perhaps Members will get up here and insist that we must have some sort of a bill, and that here this is, and we must put it through, because it is only a few days until March, and the President will return the roads. That is the frame of mind some people are in—a half-hearted, evasive frame of mind that apologizes for what it is going to do. But this excuse for jamming the bill through is a bad one. We can reject the conference report and send the bill back to conference for such changes to be made in it as will make it a decent and fair bill for the people of the country as well as the railroads. We can easily send this bill back to conference and require it to be changed and amended in such manner as to be an acceptable and honest bill, fair alike to all interests. Any argument that we are bound to swallow the report of the conferees before us in order to pass any law upon the subject at all is based on a false premise.

Another thing. Assuming that the President is without power to recall his order turning the railroads back on March 1, Congress can in a few minutes pass a resolution directing that the railroads be held by the President for a few days longer, so as to give all the time we might need for further and careful consideration of the subject. Out then upon the argument that we must act now and upon the measure before us only.

I have explained this to you gentlemen, not pretending to instruct you, for that would be presumption on my part, but merely to remind you that we need no legislation in order to get rid of the railroads, and that if we wish to legislate there is ample time and means to do so without being hurried with it.

Now, we may go further. If we turn down the conference report, reject it in toto and send it back to conference, they will have opportunity to discuss, to negotiate, and to reach terms which are acceptable to the people and in the best interests of this country. They have several days yet in which to do it.

The responsibility for the situation is not on the Democrats. This condition was not produced by this side. Last May the President gave notice that on the first of the year he would turn back the railroads. For eight months those in control of Congress dillydallied, delayed, and chaffered. When the time came to turn the roads back nothing had been done. Then the President gave another stay of execution and gave two months more. Now for two months more the mountain has been laboring.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SISSON. I yield to the gentleman 10 more minutes.

#### "THE WITCHES' CALDRON."

Mr. HUDDLESTON. This pot has been boiling. We had but one day's notice that the Esch bill was coming up in the House, and nobody had time to read it before it was brought up for discussion. We considered it for two or three days, and then it was rammed through. The Senate took their action. Then a few days elapsed and the bill went to conference. Months of conference, months of secret consultations—

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. No; I must decline to yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. For weeks the conferees considered this bill in secret conference. Nobody knows what went on. Back somewhere in a room, locked up, they took all the time needed for conference, but we are to have none for discussion and consideration in the House. Now they come back here at the last moment. The pot has been boiling and boiling, and from the result which the conferees have produced I think it must have been some kind of a witches' caldron—

"Eye of newt and toe of frog,  
Wool of bat and tongue of dog."

God knows what else they must have put into the pot to have brought out such a mess as they have spread before Congress and the country.

We took the railroads over for their own benefit. They had broken down. They were inadequate. We took them over to keep them out of bankruptcy. We have paid them more than they ought to have had. We have paid them an extravagant return. I opposed it at the time it was agreed to. We have rehabilitated them and reequipped them and spent the people's money on them, and now, behold, having done all this, it is proposed by this measure not merely to turn the railroads back but to pay their owners for taking them back. That is what I say the people of this country will resent. That is what I say they will punish, and they ought to punish it.

#### GOVERNMENT GUARANTEES PROFITS.

I have some figures here. It is proposed to guarantee to these railroads not less than 5½ per cent net earnings, and in addition to that we are to permit them to charge additional rates to the extent of 1 per cent on their valuation for a revolving fund and for one purpose and another. Any way you look at it, it is money that is taken out of the people's pockets.

For the present, there being no other way of ascertaining the value of the railroads, their book value as carried by them must necessarily be accepted as the basis upon which this percentage is to be paid. That means that not only will the actual investment in the railroads be realized upon at 5½ per cent net, but the people will be taxed upon all the water that has been injected into them, upon all the fraud and stealing that has gone on. They will have to pay the railroad owners their 5½, 6, or 6½ per cent on that as well as on the true value.

The approximate value of the railroads as carried on their books is \$19,000,000,000, upon which a 6½ per cent return will be about \$1,300,000,000. Now, the "standard return" which we have paid during Government control has yielded to the railroads about 5 per cent on their value, water and all. We have been paying them 5 per cent return upon their water already, and it is proposed to increase that return to somewhere from \$200,000,000 to \$500,000,000 more by this measure.

Some people believe the Government has lost money in running the railroads. The real truth about it is that there has been little or no actual loss, and that Federal control has been a success if we consider it fairly in all its aspects. But we have spent more money than we have got back, and that is the chief reason why the people of this country have been encouraged to turn the railroads back. But when you turn them back under the terms of this bill the people will not only have to make good the loss we have already sustained but in addition will lose somewhere from \$300,000,000 to \$500,000,000 a year under the Government's guaranty or through increased rates.

#### DIVIDENDS OF 12 PER CENT.

We have been paying many of these railroads very handsome dividends. Take for illustration the Union Pacific. Its owners have received under Federal control 12.8 per cent upon their investment. The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe has had 10 per cent and numbers of others have had 6 and 7 per cent.

But, mark you this, gentlemen, some of these roads have received under the standard returns no net income because they had not made any net income before Government control. We have not paid them anything in net profits. By the new arrangement provided by the conferees' report the guaranty to these roads that have not earned anything for years is 5½ per cent return upon their capitalization, water and all. When you begin to figure out that, you observe that there will be a vast increase in the return to many of these bankrupt roads that at present are liabilities and not assets. They earn nothing and are worth nothing, but the Government must pay them the 5½ per cent net.

#### FULL OF JOKERS AND INIQUITIES.

I can not undertake to point out the many iniquities in this measure other than in the very hasty and general way in which I have attempted to do it. There is not time sufficient for me to do it. I have read the bill, and I have studied it, and I realize that it is full of jokers and contains many clauses that a common man can not understand. A great many of its clauses are of the authorship of men who have been brought here for that purpose. I do not mean Members of Congress or of the com-

mittee, but cunning railroad lawyers and lobbyists. Many of these jokers have been put over on the committee. They will be interpreted to mean things that were never dreamed of when the committee adopted them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. HUDDLESTON had leave to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. VAILE].

Mr. VAILE. Mr. Chairman, it is quite evident from the impatience of the gentleman from Alabama and from the argument he makes that that argument would not stand the test of interrogation. I rise to say good-by to the gentleman, for I understand that I am to be beaten when the people find me out. Anyway, one of us will be beaten when they find us both out. So good-by. [Laughter.]

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I have no opposition, so it must mean the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. EMERSON].

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, there have been many bills introduced by Members of Congress to provide for a bonus for the soldiers, sailors, marines, and others who have served their country during the recent World War. I have introduced two myself, and after investigating the matter very thoroughly I have come to the conclusion that the first thing to be done is for the soldiers, sailors, and marines to get together through their representatives, decide the kind of a bill they want, let the Members of Congress know, and we will pass it. I believe Congress is ready and willing, and I believe the people of this country are ready and willing to provide the money, to grant a bonus, if such it must be called, to those brave men and women, who left their families, wives, and husbands, children, parents, friends, and warm and peaceful firesides and went 3,000 miles away to uphold the honor of the Nation and the glory of the Republic.

We who remained at home made no sacrifice. These men and women are the only ones who made any sacrifice, and we who remained at home have no right to ask the cost or where the money is coming from.

Many of them died. It is our duty to care for their dependents and honor their memories.

Many of them were maimed and wounded. It is our duty to care for them and make them as near whole as possible, whether they had war-risk insurance or not. I never was much of a believer in the provision that made the soldier pay for his own risk that we forced upon him by entering the war.

Many others went and served their country faithfully, for \$30 per month, less insurance charges, while the alien slacker, who claimed his exemption because of his alienage, remained at home and earned from \$5 to \$25 per day.

Why, we treated the alien enemies within our gates better than we did our soldiers, for they, together with the alien slacker, remained here under the protection of our flag, safe from danger and earned large wages, and some of them are now holding the positions held by our soldiers before they went to war.

It is our duty as representatives of a grateful people to see that something is done to sort of even up this inequality. It is not a bonus or a gratuity, it is a debt we owe them.

We are the richest people in the world and ours is the richest country in the world, and yet we have done less for our soldiers, sailors, and marines than has any other nation in the world engaged in this war.

We have not done as much for them as have some of the States in this Union. The States of New Hampshire and Massachusetts have given their soldiers, sailors, and marines the sum of \$100 each. The State of Minnesota has allowed each soldier toward his education the sum of \$200. The new State of North Dakota has allowed each of her loyal sons the sum of \$25 for each month of service with which to purchase a farm or go into business. The State of Oregon allows each of her defenders the sum of \$25 per month toward his education. The State of Wisconsin has given each of her fighting men \$10 for each month's service, but not less than \$50 in any event.

Yet the United States, that squandered millions on this war, paid the contractors all they asked, loaned money to Europe by the billions, and extends the time of the payment of the interest; the United States that squandered millions on ships, millions on flying machines, millions on railroads, has done less for her brave men and women than the poorest country engaged in this war.

No one asked where this money came from, but just as sure as something is asked for the soldier, sailor, or marine some ingrate asks, where is the money coming from?

Sixty dollars is all we pay our fighting men. Not enough to buy a suit of clothes. A soldier who returned and only had his bonus did not have enough to provide himself with an outfit and live for a day, and unless he had relatives or a job ready he found himself hard pressed.

But some one asks where is the money coming from? Why from taxes, of course, the same way in which we secure all the money with which we pay all of our bills. Is it wrong to collect taxes and pay the men who saved the honor of the Nation in the hour of its greatest peril? Was it wrong for the States and the National Government to pay bounties during the Civil War? All collected by taxation.

Why Canada, much poorer than this country, has done several times as much for her private soldiers as we have, and more for her officers. She pays each private soldier from \$280 to \$600. Just think of it; in some instances ten times as much as we pay. As one Canadian told me, "We can not afford it, but we are going to do it, for we owe it to them."

France bled white. France who lost her sons by the thousands, almost by the millions, and had the enemy upon her soil for over four years, pays her private soldiers from \$82.99 to \$233.53. All these countries pay their officers much more.

All of these countries were in the war much longer than we were, and some of them had the invader upon their soil and destroying the wealth of the country. This country is now in the midst of an unequalled prosperity. We can afford to do justice to these men and women, and if we do not do it we will suffer for it in the near future. We will need these men in the future. We need them now. In these days of unrest we need the strong arm and the moral support of those who fought the battles of the Republic.

We had no war-risk insurance during the Civil War, yet we have paid and paid justly and gladly to the defenders of the Union millions—yes, billions—of dollars, and no one has ever uttered a protest. The people would rather tax themselves to pay this bonus than to tax themselves to pay certain debts contracted during the war and even since. We might sell some of the war material that is now wasting and help pay this bonus. We might get a little better price for those German ships and help pay this bonus. We might be a little more concerned about the people at home and less about the people in some other country. Oftentimes we hear the question asked, Who won the war? Well, it was not the desk officer, although he did his part. It was not the munition worker or the munition manufacturer, although they did their part. It was not the banker or the farmer, the contractor, or the merchant. It was the boy who took his life in his own hands and went into the trenches and went over the top. It was the man behind the gun, the man up in the aeroplane, and down in the trenches. It was the sailor who carried the soldier over. It was the marine who covered himself with glory. It was the nurse in the hospital who cared for the wounded and dying. It was not any of us who remained at home and bought Liberty bonds who won the war. It was the man who dared. It was the man who risked his life for you and for me. It was not the President. It was not Congress. It was our soldiers, sailors, marines, nurses, and all who did active service near danger. We can never pay the debt we owe them. We can simply show our appreciation in this very small way by doing justice now. [Applause.]

I desire to attach a statement showing what States in this Union and what other countries have done for their soldiers, sailors, and marines.

#### STATE LAWS GIVING A BONUS TO SOLDIERS, SAILORS, AND MARINES.

Massachusetts (Laws, 1919, ch. 283): All honorably discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines who resided in the Commonwealth at least six months prior to entry into service and who entered the service subsequent to February 3, 1917, and prior to November 11, 1919, are given the sum of \$100.

Minnesota (Laws, 1919, ch. 338): All honorably discharged male citizens and residents of the State who served in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps are allowed tuition not to exceed \$200 at any school within the State which maintained a Students' Army Training Corps.

New Hampshire (Laws, 1919, ch. 140, as amended by special session, 1919, ch. 1): All residents of the State who served prior to November 12, 1918, in any capacity in the military or naval service, including Marine Corps, are entitled to \$100 in recognition of such service.

North Dakota (Laws, 1919, ch. 206, as amended by special session, 1919, ch. 55): Each honorably discharged citizen who served in the military and naval service is entitled to \$25 for each month or fraction thereof that he was in service for the purpose of purchasing a home or farm, establishing or investing in a business or trade, or for educational training.

Oregon (Laws, 1919, ch. 428): All honorably discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines who were inducted or enlisted in the State are desired to pursue a course of study in any institution in the State are

allowed a sum not in excess of \$25 for any one month, and not over \$200 for any one year, for a period of not more than four years. This act not to include members of Students' Army Training Corps or limited service men who did not leave the United States.

Wisconsin (Laws, 1919, ch. 667): Each soldier, sailor, marine, or nurse who at the time of induction into service was a resident of the

State is given \$10 for each month of service with a minimum of \$50 as a token of appreciation. Not to apply for time spent in students' Army training camps or to a person who although inducted into service did civilian work at civilian pay.

NOTE.—The acts of the 1919 sessions of Alabama, Florida, Iowa, and North Carolina have not been received in the Library of Congress.

*War gratuities for military men of various countries, commissioned officers and enlisted men.*

NOT OVERSEAS.

	Italy.	France (not with fighting units).	Great Britain.	Canada.	United States.
<b>Commissioned officers:</b>					
Major general.....	1,916½ to 4,416½ lires (\$369.92 to \$852.42).	Special.....	£500 to £1,500 (\$2,430 to \$7,290).	\$744 to \$2,392.....	\$60.
Brigadier general.....		Special.....	£166½ to £1,000 (\$810 to \$4,860).	\$403 to \$1,380.....	\$60.
Colonel.....	1,583½ to 3,583½ lires (\$305.58 to \$691.58).	Special.....	£149½ to £750 (\$724.34 to \$3,645).	\$232.50 to \$874.....	\$60.
Lieutenant colonel.....	1,550 to 3,166½ lires (\$241.25 to \$611.17).	Special.....	£139½ to £550 (\$679.99 to \$2,673).	\$193.75 to \$759.....	\$60.
Major.....	1,083½ to 2,541½ lires (\$209.08 to \$490.54).	Special.....	£109½ to £500 (\$532.17 to \$2,430).	\$155 to \$613.33½.....	\$60.
Captain.....	916½ to 2,250 lires (\$176.92 to \$434.25).	385 to 970 francs (\$74.31 to \$187.21).	£82½ to £400 (\$399.13 to \$1,944).	\$116½ to \$467.66½.....	\$60.
Lieutenant.....	650 to 1,750 lires (\$125.45 to \$337.75).	385 to 970 francs (\$74.31 to \$187.21).	£69½ to £300 (\$340 to \$1,458).	\$80.60 to \$361.86½.....	\$60.
Second lieutenant.....	583½ to 1,083½ lires (\$112.58 to \$209.08).	385 to 970 francs (\$74.31 to \$187.21).	£63½ to £250 (\$310.43 to \$1,215).	\$80.60 to \$361.86½.....	\$60.
<b>Enlisted men:</b>					
Warrant officer.....	230 to 380 lires (\$44.39 to \$73.34).	385 to 970 francs (\$74.31 to \$187.21).	£15 to £27 (\$72.99 to \$131.22).	\$71.30 to \$318.93½.....	\$60.
Sergeant major.....	230 to 380 lires (\$44.39 to \$73.34).	385 to 970 francs (\$74.31 to \$187.21).	£12 to £24 (\$58.32 to \$116.64).	\$70 to \$300.....	\$60.
Quartermaster sergeant.....	230 to 380 lires (\$44.39 to \$73.34).	385 to 970 francs (\$74.31 to \$187.21).	£12 to £24 (\$58.32 to \$116.64).	\$70 to \$300.....	\$60.
Color sergeant.....	230 to 380 lires (\$44.39 to \$73.34).	385 to 970 francs (\$74.31 to \$187.21).	£12 to £24 (\$58.32 to \$116.64).	\$70 to \$300.....	\$60.
Sergeant.....	230 to 380 lires (\$44.39 to \$73.34).	385 to 970 francs (\$74.31 to \$187.21).	£8 to £20 (\$38.88 to \$97.20).	\$70 to \$300.....	\$60.
Corporal.....	230 to 380 lires (\$44.39 to \$73.34).	385 to 970 francs (\$74.31 to \$187.21).	£6 to £18 (\$29.16 to \$87.48).	\$70 to \$300.....	\$60.
Private.....	180 to 330 lires (\$34.74 to \$63.69).	385 to 970 francs (\$74.31 to \$187.21).	£5 to £17 (\$24.30 to \$82.62).	\$70 to \$300.....	\$60.
Length of service.....	1 year to 4 years 3 months..	1 year to 4 years 3 months..	1 year to 5 years.....	Unmarried man for 1 year, up to married man for 3 years.	On discharge.

OVERSEAS.

	Italy.	France (with fighting units).	Australia.	Great Britain.	Canada.	United States.
<b>Commissioned officers:</b>						
Major general.....	1,916½ to 4,416½ lires (\$369.92 to \$852.42).	Special.....	£51 11s. 3d. to £154 13s. 10d. (\$250.61 to \$751.82).	£500 to £1,500 (\$2,430 to \$7,290).	\$2,928 to \$4,758.....	\$60.
Brigadier general.....		Special.....	£36 to £108 (\$174.96 to \$524.88).	£166½ to £1,000 (\$810 to \$4,860).	\$1,586 to \$2,745.....	\$60.
Colonel.....	1,583½ to 3,583½ lires (\$305.58 to \$691.58).	Special.....	£36 to £108 (\$174.96 to \$524.88).	£149½ to £750 (\$724.34 to \$3,645).	\$915 to \$1,738.50.....	\$60.
Lieutenant colonel.....	1,250 to 3,166½ lires (\$241.25 to \$611.17).	Special.....	£30 7s. 6d. to £91 2s. 6d. (\$147.62 to \$442.87).	£139½ to £550 (\$679.99 to \$2,673).	\$762.50 to \$1,509.75.....	\$60.
Major.....	1,083½ to 2,541½ lires (\$209.08 to \$490.54).	Special.....	£24 15s. to £74 5s. (\$120.29 to \$360.86).	£109½ to £500 (\$532.17 to \$2,430).	\$610 to \$1,220.....	\$60.
Captain.....	916½ to 2,250 lires (\$176.92 to \$434.25).	430 to 1,210 francs (\$82.99 to \$233.58).	£19 2s. 6d. to £57 7s. 6d. (\$92.95 to \$278.84).	£82½ to £400 (\$399.13 to \$1,944).	\$457.50 to \$930.25.....	\$60.
Lieutenant.....	650 to 1,750 lires (\$125.45 to \$337.75).	430 to 1,210 francs (\$82.99 to \$233.58).	£15 7s. 6d. to £46 2s. 6d. (\$74.72 to \$224.17).	£69½ to £300 (\$340 to \$1,458).	\$317.20 to \$719.80.....	\$60.
Second lieutenant.....	583½ to 1,083½ lires (\$112.58 to \$209.08).	430 to 1,210 francs (\$82.99 to \$233.58).	£15 7s. 6d. to £46 2s. 6d. (\$74.72 to \$224.17).	£63½ to £250 (\$310.43 to \$1,215).	\$317.20 to \$719.80.....	\$60.
<b>Enlisted men:</b>						
Warrant officer.....	230 to 380 lires (\$44.39 to \$73.34).	430 to 1,210 francs (\$82.99 to \$233.58).	£12 15s. to £38 5s. (\$61.97 to \$185.90).	£15 to £39 (\$72.99 to \$189.54).	\$280.60 to \$634.40.....	\$60.
Sergeant major.....	230 to 380 lires (\$44.39 to \$73.34).	430 to 1,210 francs (\$82.99 to \$233.58).	£14 5s. to £33 15s. (\$54.63 to \$164.03).	£12 to £36 (\$58.32 to \$174.96).	\$280 to \$600.....	\$60.
Quartermaster sergeant.....	230 to 380 lires (\$44.39 to \$73.34).	430 to 1,210 francs (\$82.99 to \$233.58).	£10 17s. 6d. to £32 12s. 6d. (\$53.85 to \$158.56).	£12 to £36 (\$58.32 to \$174.96).	\$280 to \$600.....	\$60.
Color sergeant.....	230 to 380 lires (\$44.39 to \$73.34).	430 to 1,210 francs (\$82.99 to \$233.58).	£11 5s. to £33 15s. (\$54.68 to \$164.03).	£12 to £36 (\$58.32 to \$174.96).	\$280 to \$600.....	\$60.
Sergeant.....	230 to 380 lires (\$44.39 to \$73.34).	430 to 1,210 francs (\$82.99 to \$233.58).	£10 2s. 6d. to £30 7s. 6d. (\$49.21 to \$147.62).	£8 to £32 (\$38.88 to \$155.52).	\$280 to \$600.....	\$60.
Corporal.....	230 to 380 lires (\$44.39 to \$73.34).	430 to 1,210 francs (\$82.99 to \$233.58).	£9 15s. to £29 5s. (\$47.39 to \$142.10).	£6 to £30 (\$29.16 to \$145.80).	\$280 to \$600.....	\$60.
Private.....	180 to 330 lires (\$34.74 to \$63.69).	430 to 1,210 francs (\$82.99 to \$233.58).	£6 15s. to £20 5s. (\$32.81 to \$98.42).	£5 to £29 (\$24.30 to \$140.94).	\$280 to \$600.....	\$60.
Length of service.....	1 year to 4 years 3 months..	1 year to 4 years 3 months..	1 year to 3 years.....	1 year to 5 years.....	Unmarried man for 1 year, up to married man for 3 years.	On discharge.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield fifteen minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON].

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, since the election returns from the third Missouri district have been received, showing increased Democratic majority, I suppose our Republican friends will cease claiming Texas in the next general election. But that is not what I rose to discuss. What I desire to briefly discuss is the question of rural highway construction—of Federal aid in the construction of good roads.

There is a vital connection between good roads and farming

and a still more vital connection between farming and the high cost of living. Complaint is heard everywhere of the high cost of living, and complaint as to scarcity of food is general throughout the world. Upon one phase of this question all seem to be agreed, and that is that no substantial and permanent relief can come until there is a marked increase in production. We may pass all kinds of drastic laws against profiteering but will find no certain remedy until production is greatly increased. If the prices of food products are to come down, we must produce more wheat, corn, cattle, hogs, sheep, dairy products, poultry,

eggs, garden vegetables, and so forth. This can be done only in two ways—first, by more intensive and intelligent methods of production so that greater crops can be produced by those already engaged in agriculture, and, second, by increasing the number of people already engaged in agricultural pursuits.

While there have been great advances made in agricultural knowledge as result of experience, instruction afforded in agricultural colleges and other schools teaching this subject, also as result of the great work done by the Department of Agriculture through farm-demonstration work, distribution of bulletins, and various other ways by the different agencies of the department, yet in spite of all this people continue to leave the farms in droves, not so much for the reason that farming is not profitable but because of the isolation, lack of social advantages, lack of good roads and other necessary improvements and advantages that go to make country life attractive. Something must speedily be done to stop the rush from farms to the cities and towns or serious consequences will ensue.

When the Agricultural appropriation bill was under consideration in the House last week the majority side of this House trimmed down many of the items far below the estimates of the department and the needs of the country, one member of the committee stating on the floor of the House that where there was any doubt at all he resolved that doubt in favor of economy. No man is more in favor of proper economy than I am, as my record here will show; but at the time when there is unusual demand, world-wide, for a greater production of the prime necessities of life, it is no time for parsimonious action upon this vital subject. This is a penny-wise and pound-foolish economy and bound to work great injury to the entire country. What we need to do is to encourage and stimulate, and not discourage, those who are engaged in the most important of all pursuits, that of raising food for our own people and the hungry nations of the world.

No one thing that can possibly be done will have greater influence in making country life and farm life happy and contented, as well as profitable, increasing production and lowering the cost of living, than the building of good rural highways. The Sixty-third Congress, which was Democratic, realized the great importance of this matter and took the first effective steps ever taken toward carrying out a policy of giving Federal aid in building a better system of public roads. That Congress constituted the first Committee on Public Roads, which was appointed June 3, 1913, Judge Shackelford being the first chairman. I have had the honor of being a member of this committee since it was first created. In the Sixty-fourth Congress we passed a bill appropriating \$5,000,000 for the fiscal year of 1917, ten million for the year 1918, fifteen million for 1919, twenty million for 1920, and twenty-five million for the year 1921. Then, in the Post Office appropriation bill in the Sixty-fifth Congress, also Democratic, we supplemented the original appropriation by the additional amounts as follows: Fifty million for the fiscal year 1919, seventy-five million for the year 1920, and seventy-five million for 1921, making a total of two hundred and seventy-five million appropriated by a Democratic Congress for the years 1917 to 1921, inclusive.

Mr. LAYTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I will.

Mr. LAYTON. The gentleman says that the committee made such a basis for distribution. The State I represent gets less than any State in the Federal Union, and yet it pays more income tax than nine States south of Mason and Dixon's line and less than nine States north of Mason and Dixon's line. Does not the gentleman think there ought to be a fair distribution of the money?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I do not care to go into a discussion of that subject elaborately, but I will say that the needs of Federal road construction can not be based on wealth, as the gentleman seems to assume. It is based on the needs of the rural communities of the various States, and if he will study the law he will see that it is eminently fair and fully justifies the money expended under the bill.

These appropriations were made by the Sixty-fourth and Sixty-fifth Congresses, the first covering a period of five years and the second a period of three years. As a result of this action on the part of the Federal Government, road building throughout the entire country has been given a mighty impetus. The various States are cooperating freely with the National Government, and road building is going forward by leaps and bounds. Encouraged by the Federal aid, the States are increasing their revenues for road building, and the counties in order to cooperate with the State and Federal authorities are voting bonds and getting ready in every way to carry forward at full speed successful road-building programs. What has this

Congress done to show its interest in the farmers of the country or to assist or encourage road building? If the Committee on Roads is functioning at all, I have never heard of it. I think there have been one or two short meetings, held sometime last summer, to consider a project out in Oregon or on the Pacific slope. In the last or the Sixty-fifth Congress, which was Democratic, we not only made additional appropriation of \$200,000,000, as before stated, to aid in the construction of good roads, but we also provided for, or authorized, the War Department to turn over to the highway authorities of the different States certain machinery, war material, equipment, supplies, and so forth, suitable for use in the improvement of highways, the same to be distributed to the highway departments of the several States and used on roads constructed in whole or in part by Federal aid. Under this authority the Secretary of War has turned over quite a number of Army trucks, but has not complied with the full intention and purpose of the statute, as there is on hand, held by the War Department, a lot of other material, machinery, and so forth, such as steam shovels, hoisting derricks, scrapers, plows, wagon loaders, and so forth, which are badly needed by the various highway authorities.

At the urgent request of the various highway authorities of the several States there was passed through the Senate on the 22d of October last a bill directing the War Department to turn over to the highway authorities of the various States machinery, material, and so forth, aforementioned. For some reason that bill was delayed in the House until the present week, when it was finally passed upon the suspension of the rules. However, a change was made in the Senate bill, necessitating its return to that body for concurrence, and if it sleeps there as long as it has in this body it will not become a law until much of this machinery is ruined by exposure to the weather or has been disposed of by the War Department. To my knowledge the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee urged upon the Rules Committee again and again that a special rule be given making this legislation in order. I have received numerous letters from the chairman of the State highway commission of North Carolina emphasizing the great need of this machinery, material, and so forth, to be used in road construction in the several States, as originally intended.

It would be interesting to know why this legislation has been so long delayed. Is it possible that it is being strangled for political expediency, or has Will Hays, the national Republican chairman, given orders that it must be killed by long delay? If this kind of tactics is to be continued by a Republican Congress, then Mr. Hays will need to offer more than \$10,000 for some one who can write a satisfactory platform, and need to appoint a larger advisory committee than the one already appointed, containing 171 members. You need not be deceived, the people will not be mocked. The farmers of the country know what party has given them substantial relief by the enactment of numerous pieces of legislation in their interest, such as the rural-credits law, good-roads legislation, and so forth, bringing more favorable conditions to those engaged in agriculture. But when they ask relief or help in any way of this Congress they are confronted with the response that everything must be subordinated to economy. When the people ask bread they are given a stone. Political expediency is the governing policy of this Congress and has been since the day it first assembled. Instead of considering first the interests of all the people, the needs of the Republican Party in the coming campaign are given the right of way. As the matter now stands, the last appropriation for carrying on the work of road building expires at the end of the fiscal year 1921, and the Department of Agriculture and Bureau of Roads do not know whether to go ahead with plans for the future or not. If this Congress intends to continue the splendid work now in progress it should, by appropriate legislation, extend the present road-building plan, or one similar, for a period of at least three years, so the Bureau of Roads can go ahead with its work. "He that provideth not for his own household hath denied the Faith, and is worse than an infidel." And if we fail to provide adequate legislation for the great American household, we will merit and receive a just rebuke from them. Efficiency should be our first motto, then economy. Not a dollar should be collected in taxes save and except for proper and necessary purposes, and every dollar so collected should be wisely and economically expended. Joshua commanded the sun to stand still in order that he might fight the battles of the Lord, and the sun obeyed. Will Hays, the chairman of the national Republican committee, has commanded this Congress to stand still for the purpose of political expediency, and it has obeyed. When an epidemic of influenza breaks out in the country we do not economize by employing fewer doctors, closing drug stores, and discharging

trained nurses, but we use these agencies for the restoration of the sick to health and the prevention of the spread of the disease.

Mr. MORGAN. The gentleman has referred to rural-credits legislation. The gentleman has been greatly interested in that, and I would like to know if he is familiar with the provision in this bill which provides that the Federal Farm Loan Board shall levy an assessment on the banks, on the borrowers, to pay the expenses of the Federal Farm Loan Board at Washington, amounting to \$284,000 a year?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I have heard a statement made, but have not studied the provisions.

Mr. MORGAN. Does the gentleman approve of that provision?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I do not.

Mr. MORGAN. I am glad to hear the gentleman is not in favor of that provision in the bill.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I am not; I am in favor of everything that helps the farmer. May I ask the gentleman from Oklahoma a question?

Mr. MORGAN. Certainly.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I see it reported in the newspapers that he has requested a Republican caucus in order to get consideration of his bill for relief of returned soldiers. Is he driven to that extreme in order to get his own party to take up that needed legislation?

Mr. MORGAN. We have not had any conference yet, but I think we are going to act without a conference.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I was just asking whether the newspaper article which I read was a true statement.

When we were in control of the Sixty-fourth and Sixty-fifth Congresses our Republican friends clamored and complained about the high cost of living, and one would have thought that when they came into power they would have brought the cost of living down by magic, but since they assumed control of the legislative branch of our Government living costs have soared until the blue sky is the limit. And yet they do nothing but criticize the administration. Did I say nothing? Beg pardon, they did increase the tariff on shirt buttons about five or ten hundred per cent and the price of shirts has increased about 100 per cent. When we were in control of Congress you accused us of being rubber stamps, and only registering the will of the administration, but under the leadership of our President we went forward with a positive, well-balanced program of wise, constructive legislation, in the interest of all classes—the farmer, the business man, the wage earner—and as a result the country has experienced the greatest period of prosperity in the history of this or any other country. As a result of our legislation the country prospered before the war, during the war, and since the war. Where is their program of constructive legislation, either enacted or contemplated, to match such legislation as the Federal reserve law, rural credits act, farm demonstration act, Bureau of Markets, parcel-post law, Federal Trade Commission, and numerous other salutary measures which might be mentioned? They will not dare repeal any of this legislation, not even the Underwood tariff bill, against which they inveighed incessantly before coming into control of Congress.

I pause for any one Republican to tell me what legislation they have enacted or what they contemplate that will match this remedial, constructive, necessary legislation that we placed on the statute books at the demand of the American people.

Playing politics may seem temporarily expedient, but you will need something to go before the country with in the next campaign save and except expediency, false economy, and destructive criticism. You are now sowing to the wind and are bound to reap the whirlwind, and when placed in the balance of justice and weighed upon the record you are making you will be found wanting by the American people and the just recompense of your reward will be political death. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Carss].

Mr. Carss. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I have looked forward with great interest for the return of this conference report, realizing, as I do, that this is perhaps the most important piece of legislation that will be brought to the attention of Congress at this session.

The question of transportation is one of the fundamentals on which our modern complex civilization rests. There is not one of our 110,000,000 people who is not vitally interested in the proper solution of this great problem. I regret exceedingly that the membership of the House has not had proper time to study this bill. The report was available on Wednesday at 6 p. m. and the bill is put on passage at 11 a. m. Saturday. I

do not believe that there is one Member of the House, with the possible exception of the conferees, who has had time to make a thorough examination or study of the bill.

This railroad bill is being railroad through the House, and on a pretty fast schedule. I desire to refer briefly to the labor feature of this bill. I believe that I have a fair understanding of the wishes of the 2,000,000 men and women employed on the railroads of this country. They are a class of citizens who rank second to none in the love of and loyalty to this great democracy. They take to themselves no special credit for their loyalty and sacrifice to the cause of democracy during the Great War, but they do protest against some of the features of this bill, which they consider an infringement on their constitutional rights, and object to being set aside as the victims of the first great experiment in Government wage regulation.

They simply want to be allowed to sit down at conferences with their employer and have the opportunity to participate in a free, fair, and full discussion of their claims and grievances and settle their differences and adjust their relations in such a way that they can secure that feeling of mutual respect that leads to the cooperation that is so badly needed in American industry to-day.

Under section 301 of this bill it would appear that just such conferences as I speak of are provided for, but on further reading of the bill we find that a board is provided known as the railroad labor board. This board has arbitrary power to set aside any agreement reached by the employees and operating officers of the carriers if such agreement affects wages to the extent of unsettling rates. If the railroad employees of this country are justly entitled to increased wages they should receive increased wages regardless of the effect on freight and passenger rates. This provision of the bill would effectively prevent an increase in wages, no matter how badly needed, and at the present time I believe all fair-minded men will admit that the wages of railroad employees are at least 30 per cent lower than wages paid in other industries. This section of the bill is the initial step toward compulsory arbitration. All that is needed to bring about compulsory arbitration is to enact laws fixing a penalty for refusal to abide by the decision of the labor board.

When the railroads were taken over by the Government the railroad employees were free men. When they are turned back they want to be turned back free men. These men want the report recommitted with instructions to insert the Anderson amendment or, failing in that, they want the entire labor feature of the bill stricken out. The provisions of the bill which allow any 100 employees to select boards and take up grievances or negotiate wage agreements will result in unending confusion and have a tendency to disrupt the present organization and will lead to the breaking of agreements and general demoralization of the morale of the employees.

There is another feature of this bill that strikes me as unfair to the masses of the American people; that is the guaranty feature. I can see no justice in taxing the people, through railroad rates, to guarantee a fixed return to the holders of railroad securities. We do not guarantee the farmers any return on their investments, although the product of the farms are more necessary to sustain human life than is transportation. We lived before the advent of the railroads, but civilized humans never lived without farm products.

I also object to section 422 of this bill, which takes all over 6 per cent of the earnings of the prosperous roads and uses them for the assistance of weaker roads. I think this provision absolutely indefensible and is not justified by any sound economic or moral rule and seems to be a clear violation of the Constitution, as it takes private property for the use of the public, and without compensation. For this, if for no other reason, I could not conscientiously support and vote for the passage of this bill. Much has been said regarding the need of immediate railroad legislation. I do not feel that this great need exists. I think the proper course to take at this time is to leave the railroads where they are, and will briefly set forth my reasons.

I believe that the two things most vital at present to the people of this country, in so far as the railroad problem is concerned, are that the railroads should be able to handle the enormous and continually growing traffic, which is pouring upon their rails, and that there should be as little change in rates as possible.

Everybody knows that there are not enough cars, that facilities are inadequate, and that a billion or more dollars are needed at once for additions and improvements. Every well-informed and honest man will admit that it has been possible to carry more traffic with insufficient cars and inadequate facilities.

ties under unified control than would have been possible if the roads had been separately managed. If Federal control is continued, Congress has it within its power to supply new capital at the lowest possible cost, and in the meantime the country can retain the advantage of unified administration of every car, rail, and terminal.

Under the proposed bill every dollar of the immediately needed billion and more, over and above the \$300,000,000 which Uncle Sam is to loan to helpless companies, must be supplied by private railroad corporations whose securities are now selling at woefully low prices. There is no prospect whatever that this capital can be raised by these companies except at exorbitant cost to the people of the country, and no certainty that it can be raised at all. In the meantime the advantages of unified control will be lost unless we can expect rival companies to compose differences for the public good, which they have never been able to compose, or unless we can expect relief from the exercise by an overburdened judicial commission of administrative powers similar to but not as complete as those which have been exercised in the past two years by the Railroad Administration. The only reasonable expectation is that railroad traffic will within six months be in a worse tangle than it was in 1917, just before the Government was forced, for public protection, to take over the roads.

Although there has been all manner of loose talk about the benefits of private initiative, this bill places final responsibility for the functioning of the roads upon a judicial governing body composed of 11 men, without whose advice, consent, and regulation the private railroad managers will hardly be able to sneeze. If this commission is to exercise effectively these enormous powers, far greater than have ever been delegated to any judicial body anywhere in the world, it must build up an organization which will cost the people of the United States millions of dollars, and which will parallel in many respects and cause additional work for the still more costly private railroad organizations. The results desired can plainly be secured far more simply, with far less cost, and with much less restricted initiative by the Railroad Administration, which is now in existence and which has already done excellent work, although it has never been given a fair chance to show what it can do.

Coming to the question of rates, it is perfectly obvious that in these times there is nothing more important than the avoidance of anything that may have a tendency to increase the already highly oppressive cost of living. It is just as obvious that a general increase in railroad rates, affecting every manufactured product and every item of raw material used in the country, will have precisely such a tendency to drive the cost of living upward and that the effect of the initial increase will be greatly magnified as it is passed along the line.

Director General Hines has given us reason to believe that if Federal control is continued, which he believes should be done, an increase in rates can probably be avoided without throwing the cost of railroad service upon taxation, and that at worst only a small increase will be necessary. Under the proposed bill the commission is given the duty also of fixing rates which will yield 5½ per cent, and possibly 6 per cent, upon the aggregate "value"—aggregate value instead of fair present value—of the railroad property of the country. This "value" must be determined at once, although the valuation work which the commission is carrying on is far from completed. No one knows what this "value" will be, and at best it will be nothing better than a guess.

No one knows what the effect of this mandate to the commission will be upon rates. The country under this bill will be buying a pig in a poke. Only two things are certain. One is that the private owners of the railroads confidently believe that the result will be a large increase in rates, which will greatly elevate the value of their securities. The other is that rates will become a constantly fluctuating quantity to the detriment of the various business interests of the United States. The mandate to the commission is that it shall fix rates which shall produce earnings of 5½ or 6 per cent, but no more, upon its guess as to the value of the railroad property. If more traffic or less traffic moves than the commission anticipates, or if the cost of operation decreases or increases, or if the commission has reason to believe that its value guess was wrong, or that value has changed with new conditions, it will be its duty to adjust rates accordingly and as often as may be necessary to prevent the return from rising above or falling below the specified figure. No plan more certain of introducing confusion into the business affairs of the country or the element of speculation into railroad securities could possibly be devised.

Further uncertainty and confusion will be caused by the fact that eminent counsel believe that the provision for appropriating one-half of the excess earnings above 5½ per cent of such roads as are prosperous is unconstitutional and will test the question in the courts, and by the fact that it is proposed to deprive State commissions to an extent which will also be dependent upon court interpretation of the right to regulate railroad matters of purely local concern. On top of this it is proposed to continue the present guaranty of a standard return for a period of six months and thus give private owners an opportunity to build up their properties at the expense of the United States, unless the commission is equipped to prevent such operations by undertaking the extraordinarily difficult task of policing the accounts of every carrier in the country.

Summing the matter up, this bill will make it more difficult than it is now to provide and operate the railroad facilities which are necessary to handle the traffic of the country, will probably result in a large and wholly uncertain increase in rates, and a constantly fluctuating basis of rates thereafter, but will give Wall Street bankers the satisfaction of returning to the seats of railroad power which they have occupied in so lucrative a manner in the past. The alternative is to leave the railroads where they now are—in the hands of the Federal Government—to give the Railroad Administration proper support, so that it can proceed with necessary additions and improvements, to avoid uncertainty and unsettlement of railroad affairs in these times of general unrest, and to postpone final solution of the railroad problem until it can be faced with deliberation and sanity. [Applause.]

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I now yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McCLINTIC].

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, inasmuch as this discussion has covered many subjects, I wish to use the 10 minutes allotted to me to call attention to some information that, I think, will be of value relative to the State of Oklahoma.

When this section of the United States was set apart for the colonization of the various Indian tribes, some of the Indians were displeased and refused to follow the advice of the Government authorities. At that time they never dreamed what the future had in store for them, and that this particular section of the country, when fully developed, would prove to be the richest section of the Nation. Since that time some of the Indian tribes who refused to move to Indian Territory have come to Congress asking that they be allowed to participate in the distribution of the wealth that has come to those who listened to the advice of the Government.

It may be of interest to know that in the State of Oklahoma there is one Indian who even refused to take a Government allotment. This made it necessary that the Indian Department select a tract of land for him, which happened to be on the top of an oil dome, and to-day he is the richest Indian in the world. A few weeks ago he gave \$1,500,000 to charity. In the Osage Nation, where the Indians own all their property in common, each member of the tribe has a community interest in all of the money that is derived from the production of oil, and each member of the tribe gets approximately \$2,000 a year.

Many other citizens of Oklahoma have amassed huge fortunes, and practically all of them before coming to Oklahoma were men without means. Those who have prospered in the development of the State's natural resources represent every occupation of life. I happen to know of a young man who was formerly a secretary to a Member of Congress. In the early development of an oil field he secured possession of a number of leases, and to-day he is rated as being worth over a million. The president of one of our large oil companies did not have sufficient money to take passage on a passenger train, and now he does not object to having it told that he came into the State without any money, aboard a freight car.

Mr. Chairman, I desire to have sent to the Clerk's desk, to have read in my time, a short statement published in my State, which will give the people of the country some idea of the wonderful development of the natural resources and agricultural interests in the State of Oklahoma.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

OKLAHOMA IS SOME KID, ALL RIGHT.

The industrial department of the Missouri, Kansas & Texas Railway, in cooperation with the field agent of the United States Bureau of Crop Estimates and the statistician of the Oklahoma State Board of Agriculture, has compiled some interesting figures concerning the progress of Oklahoma, a part of which are as follows:

## AGRICULTURAL PROGRESS.

The State of Oklahoma was 12 years old last November. Its wonderful development agriculturally since Statehood is indicated in the following comparative figures from the Crop Reporter:

	1919	1907
<b>Crop:</b>		
Corn.....	\$94,488,000	\$49,837,000
Wheat.....	107,912,000	7,164,000
Oats.....	34,650,000	3,009,000
Cotton.....	188,873,000	54,948,000
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>425,923,000</b>	<b>114,958,000</b>
<b>Live stock:</b>		
Horses.....	61,752,000	54,312,000
Mules.....	31,680,000	16,128,000
Milk cows.....	38,148,000	8,788,000
Other cattle.....	63,825,000	29,024,000
Sheep.....	1,475,000	282,000
Swine.....	17,301,000	8,464,000
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>214,181,000</b>	<b>116,998,000</b>

This shows an increase in production of four leading crops in 12 years of 270 per cent and in live stock of 83 per cent. In 1909 Oklahoma ranked twenty-second in value of all crops. In 1919 the State ranks tenth in value of all crops. A good record! "I'll say it is."

## SOME COMPARISONS.

Iowa's average land is priced at \$160 an acre. Yet Oklahoma's \$38 average land produced 12 field crops in 1919 with a value per acre of only \$2.70 less than Iowa's acre value for its 12 leading crops. And Oklahoma's oats made 96 cents an acre more than Iowa's.

Oklahoma is just the size of Missouri. The borders of the two States touch. They grow the same crops. Missouri is 100 years old. Oklahoma is 12 years old. Missouri's average plow land is priced at \$72; Oklahoma's at \$38. The acre value of Oklahoma's 12 leading field crops exceeds the acre value of Missouri's 12 leading field crops by \$7.38. Oklahoma exceeds Missouri in the acre value of: Oats, \$3.93; wheat, 48 cents; rye, \$3; tame hay, \$6.90; potatoes, \$26; sweet potatoes, \$21.52. Missouri ranks eighth in value of all crops, with a total of \$549,105,000. Oklahoma ranks tenth, with a total of \$522,565,000. In the race for supremacy this hustling, inexperienced 12-year-old kid, Oklahoma, is right on the heels of "Old Missouri."

## FARMERS' INCOME FROM OIL.

Oklahoma is often thought of as an oil State rather than as an agricultural State. It leads all the States in oil and natural-gas production, with an estimated total output for 1919 of \$250,000,000 in oil and \$6,000,000 in gas. Yet this is less than half the value of farm crops alone. It is estimated that nearly half of Oklahoma's 44,000,000 acres is under oil lease. One dollar an acre is a common yearly rental. It is estimated that landowners received in 1919 from oil leases \$20,000,000; from royalties \$30,000,000; from bonuses, \$2,000,000; or a total of \$52,000,000. Adding this to the value of crops, eggs, and butter fat we get \$621,981,000 as the farmers' gross income. This gives the approximately 200,000 farms of the State an average income in 1919 of over \$3,000, not including live stock and poultry.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. UPSHAW].

Mr. UPSHAW. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, in these anxious times, when the strained relations between labor and capital make the theme on every lip and practically on every editorial page of every paper and magazine in the country, it is very refreshing, and I may say comforting, to see such an illustration of the ideal fellowship between employer and employee as I find here in the daily papers from my own home city, Atlanta. The names of 68 prominent employers of labor appear at the bottom of the article which I shall read. It is a beautiful picture, indeed, that these fair and far-visioned men buy a page in every daily newspaper in the city to show their faith in the working men of that great metropolis. Listen, gentlemen, and it will make the blood of every patriot tingle to your finger tips. Look at these blazing big letters and the stirring tribute to patriotic workingmen which follows:

## MAKING THE WORLD SAFE FOR DEMOCRACY.

Since American labor had such a hand in helping to make the world safe for democracy, it can be depended upon to help largely in making America safe from Bolshevism.

American labor will tolerate no ism that conspires and plots to undermine American industry.

American labor knows that Bolshevism hopes to get power and position by defaming or dragging down the reputation of another.

Bolshevism means this and nothing more.

Men who conspire and plot and who lend a ready ear to Bolshevism are marked by American labor, and when the hour is ripe American labor will drive them out.

The man or system that plots another's undoing is digging its own grave. Now that we are shifting from war production to peace work, in which there is a greater need of skilled workmen than ever, trained American labor will tolerate no interference from outsiders who seek to tear down and stir up strife.

There must be no intervention or interference from foreign conspirators who seek to undermine the supremacy of American manufacturers that they may profit by the exclusion of goods made in the United States of America in competition with other nations for the world's enormous demand for everything in which American industry excels in producing.

Bolshevism would reduce wages and put American labor, which is the highest paid in the world, on a par with the most miserably and miserly paid labor in Europe.

It would banish forever the opportunity of America to take supreme place in the gigantic industrial struggle now beginning.

Bolshevism has no standing with American labor.

For this reason and many others American labor and American capital must unite and crush the evil without an hour's delay.

Atlanta National Bank; Forrest & George Adair; Atlanta Cotton Oil Co.; Alexander-Sewald Co.; Asphalt Roofing Product Co.; Atlanta Auto Top & Trimming Co.; Atlanta Barbers' Supply Co.; Avery & Co.; J. P. Allen & Co.; Auto Gear & Parts Co.; Bird Wilcox Co. (Inc.); Barclay & Brandon Co.; Baylis Office Equipment Co.; George O. Barrett Co.; Breen Skirt Manufacturing Co.; C. C. Baggs Auto Co.; Brigran Motors Co.; Beaudry Motors Co.; Beall-Richards Printing Co.; G. H. Bray, Builder; Chamberlin-Johnson-DuBose; Citizens Loan Co.; Exposition Cotton Mills; Myron E. Freeman & Bro.; Fulton Supply Co.; Good Roads Supply Co.; The F. E. Golan Co.; Guarantee Loan Co.; Georgia Car & Locomotive Co.; J. W. Goldsmith, Jr.-Grant Co.; Guthman Laundry & Dry Cleaning Co.; Hightower Box & Tank Co.; J. M. High Co.; B. Mifflin Hood Brick Co.; The Hirschberg Co.; Kimball House; M. Kutz Co.; Knox & Maier Co.; H. G. Lewis & Co.; Lanham Cotton Cultivator Co.; Malsby Co.; Manget Bros. Co.; Miles & Bradt Co.; Moncrief Furnace Co.; Moll & Moll (Inc.); Nunnally & McCrea Co.; J. K. Orr Shoe Co.; Phoenix Planing Mill Co.; Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co.; Phillips & Crew Piano Co.; Ridley-Yates Co.; Roberts Marble Co.; M. Rich & Bros. Co.; L. W. Rogers Co.; J. Regenstein Co.; Sloan Paper Co.; Seeger Machine Tool Co.; the Walraven Co.; Southern Oakland Co.; Tipp Specialty Shop (Inc.); Webb & Vary Co.; West Construction Co.; O. F. Whitten Co.; W. H. Warren Co.; Benjamin D. Watkins Co.; Woodruff Machine & Manufacturing Co.; Walker Roofing Co.

Mr. Chairman, I count it an honor to represent a great city of a quarter of a million people, the commercial and educational capital of the great Southeast, where such wisdom prevails and such faith and fellowship exist between employers and employees. Last year when there was a strike by the railway shopmen the remarkable picture was seen every day—2,000 of these men who felt they had a grievance and knowing no other way to secure redress, met every morning in the great Baptist Tabernacle, seating 3,000, and opened their proceedings with song and prayer, godly men, urging the workers in overalls to be careful in their every step for their own behalf. It is in such a spirit that we find the hope of the future of both labor and capital. When a Republican like COOPER, of Ohio, and a Democrat like CARSS, of Minnesota, stalwart, honest men who have climbed out of engineers' cabs into Congress, stand here and plead that nothing be done to discourage them as they are trying to save the ranks of the workmen from the red devilry that threatens within and without, it is a call that this Congress and the country ought to honor. [Applause.]

No man of wealth is prepared to catch this vision and interpret it in terms of every-day application who has not at some time in his life known how it feels to be both hungry and tired; and no man whom we count in the ranks of labor is capable of interpreting this vision to both the inspiration and the restraint of his comrades in this critical and anxious hour who begrudges the success that has come to his employer through the dedication of intelligent energy and honest purpose.

It is not in denunciation but in counsel, not in suspicion and ferocity but faith and fellowship between each other, that peace and victory will come; and if we give proper encouragement to the workingman in his organization we will help to save him from going astray, and in the spirit of Christian duty and God-fearing fellowship we find the hope of labor, the hope of capital, the hope of America, and the hope of mankind. [Applause.]

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SCHALL].

Mr. SCHALL. Mr. Chairman, so many diverse inquiries have come to me asking the attitude of the Rules Committee upon the Sterling-Graham sedition bills and protesting against this departure from our traditions that it is impossible to answer them all, and I am moved to make a statement.

I am satisfied that this body would not pass them in their present condition. Still there are well-intentioned men who honestly believe that by shutting off fanatics who preach destruction they would be doing away with class hatred and the arousing of it, but in my opinion they would provoke the very condition they seek to remedy.

I am not in sympathy with sabotage, syndicalism, or the anarchistic movement. But I am not content that no change of our Government can be advocated. I am a Republican—a Progressive Republican, a Lincoln Republican, a Roosevelt-Johnson Republican—who glories in the American ideals and traditions and who believes in the Constitution and insists that any change in these guaranteed constitutional rights shall be made in the orderly way prescribed.

Article I of the amendments to the Constitution says:

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press, or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievance.

But I maintain that the Constitution is not so sacred an instrument that it becomes our master instead of our servant, that it can not be revised and amended to fit progress. If parties will not keep up with the thought of the masses, if the dreams of the ages can not come true, we should be worse than the Egyptian, who was in love with death and had ever in the chair of honor at his banquet board a skeleton.

The grinning death's-head of the past can not, must not, be the arbiter of the future. The past can not chain us to the tenth century, can not bury us in the sepulchers of feudal Europe. And the conditions that prevailed 142 years ago—before the inventive era—might very easily be out of harmony and should not bind us to-day, should not chain us to any part of the Constitution that has become obsolete. And the wise founders of our country fended against the racking of other Galileos, who might assert, "The world moves, the world moves," when in their Declaration of Independence, they said, "to secure the rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, \* \* \* governments are instituted, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. Whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it and to institute new government."

This proposed law, if closely construed, would bar from the mails our Declaration of Independence.

Friction of ideas creates the power that drives the engine of progress, and free discussion is its safety valve.

It is in the very conflict of opinion of men and of parties wherein lies the secret of American strength, American success, and American education. America, born in travail, baptized in the blood of patriots, reared amid privation and hardship, mastering civil dissension, breathing forth love of humanity, in its fight for the liberation of peoples and "the safety of democracy," to-day lifts its conquering head, the Hercules of the nations.

The struggle and example to the world of America has always been for liberty. As a nation aids or retards liberty, so is it blessed or cursed by the judgment of time. Ancient nations fought for territory and for glory. Alexander the Great for universal empire. Attila, the scourge of God, for plunder. Hannibal for vengeance and to fulfill a vow taken at the sacred altar. Cromwell for fanaticism. The French revolutionists for anarchy. America fought, and is still fighting, for liberty. [Applause.]

About 40 republics have followed our example of government. The shot fired at Lexington was heard round the world. It was heard in Holland; it was heard in France; it was heard in Italy; it was heard in England; it was heard in Switzerland; it was heard in Germany; it was heard in China; and there is no land where its influence has not been felt. France has sung the Marseillaise and waded through blood to her disenfranchisement. Italy, dismembered and tempest-tossed through centuries, through our example, now ordains her laws under a monarch of her choice. England, through our influence, has advanced with hesitating step to the amelioration of her less-favored classes.

The trained lightning flashes the lessons of our civilization to the home of the Pyramids. The land of the heathen has our teachers in its desolate places, and the great orb of day sets not upon the boundless triumphs and influences of America among the nations.

Free speech, free press, free discussion, free religion have made the United States the vanguard of liberty. Built by a century and a half of patriotic toil, it covers its wounds with the noblest achievements for the rights of man. It is not perfect in the administration of its vast and responsible powers. But when was it so? When shall it be so? No human work is perfect. No government in all the past has been without its misshaped ends; and few, indeed, have survived three generations without revolution. We would be more than mortal if our history did not present much that we would be glad to efface. We should be unlike all great peoples of the earth if we did not mark the ebb and flow of public virtue and the consequent struggles between the good and evil elements of a society in which freedom is at times debased to license. We have had seasons of war and of peace. We have had tidal waves of passion, with their sweeping demoralization. We have enlisted the national pride in the perilous line of conquest and vindicated it by the beneficent fruits of civilization. We have had the tempests of aggression and profound calm. We have revolutionized the policy of the Government through the bitter conflicts of

opposing opinions and it has been strengthened by its trials. We have had the fruits of national struggles transferred to the vanquished without a shade of violence. We have invoked the extreme power of impeachment in the midst of intensest political strife, and its judgment has been patriotically obeyed. We have had fraternal war, with its terrible bereavements and destruction, where the skies darkened, where the wind rose, and the storm of angry popular feeling burst in all its fury; when the wild elements of disorder hissed and seethed in maddened turmoil, and the Republic reeled and rocked in the storm of the greatest civil strife the world has ever known; when we stood upon the brink of destruction and, looking into the abyss of the future, saw the world without an America.

For four long years the battle fronts crashed in conflict and the red tide of carnage swayed to and fro. But the end came at last, and out of the havoc and wreck of battle arose that titanic figure, Gen. Grant, who extended his hand to Gen. Lee, and said, "Let us have peace." And America was again America. And born of such a strife, when sedition was a fact, are the laws that are now upon our statute-books. They have stood the test of such a time and have played their part in making our Government the example of the world.

We have completed the circle of national perils, and the virtue and intelligence and good sense of the people have ever been the safety of the Republic, and have thereby proven that the safety of our great Republic, the greatest Government in the world, lies not in its growth alone, for nations have sunk of their own ponderous weight. Not in her armies and navies, for Rome scarce knew defeat in battle, yet lives to-day but in the annals of history. It was the suppression of free speech that overthrew Rome. Not in the perfection of her laws, for laws when suppressive will be disregarded, and disregarded law is poison, eats away the very pillars on which rests the temple of liberty, undermines our independence, and stands like an evil spirit behind the Stars and Stripes, ready to strike when the moment shall come the emblem of liberty to the earth and hoist in its place the black flag of anarchy.

The safety of our Republic lies in her free institutions, in free speech, free press, and our public schools, from whose towers the Stars and Stripes proclaim the spirit of our coming men. [Applause.]

Why make laws for sedition when we have laws sufficient on our statute books? By the addition of the words "proposes" and "urges" before "incites," the "one-man act," so called—section 5334—would, in my opinion, be sufficiently strengthened to take care of any contingency. The other section, the two-man act—section 5336—is admittedly sufficient as it is. We have recently provided adequate law to deal with aliens. This bill is aimed at Americans. Ship the aliens out of the country and hang the American who is too free with his opinion!

We have downed kaiserism and imperialism and militarism over there only to try to foster it over here by the introduction of such measures as these sedition bills. I am not pleading the cause of the radical, but the cause of the Republic, its traditions, its principles. Even Germany under Bismarck could not stand such ordinances. A law was passed against being a socialist. It made socialists by the thousand, till their party grew so powerful that they caused its repeal.

James I of England said of the Puritans, "I will make them conform or I will harry them out of the country." But the outcome of his oppressive efforts was a Puritan Party, of strength sufficient "in 50 years to deliver up James's son to the executioner."

The Federalist Party fathered such a bill and it proved its death knell.

The Sterling and Graham bills or the Attorney General's bill, in the form in which it comes before the Rules Committee, in my opinion is bristling with iniquity, is unconstitutional, is a possible instrument for the greatest tyranny, and carries extreme and cruel punishment. From abridgement of speech, press, petition, and assembly, which abridgement is expressly forbidden by the Constitution, it is but a step to the everlasting "verboten" of kaiserism. With its death penalty for a radical opinion, it takes us back to hanging and burning for witchcraft. It makes a mock of our war for democracy.

It is a vicious bill in principle. It would foster an intolerable spy system and unlawful interference with individual liberty.

This proposed law insidiously interweaves what is crime with what is not crime, so that it enmeshes within its toils the users of force against the Government with those who advocate a change of law or criticize public officials, measures, or law. It would terrorize and intimidate the weak in their effort to ameliorate their condition, while it would be a screen for the outrageous profiteer to hide his gains behind and the official who disregards or slights the law to shield himself withal.

It opens the way for the surveillance of mail by the Postmaster General, which, in the hands of a petty minded official, becomes an instrument of unbearable tyranny.

Without due process of law one man has it in his discretion to bar a paper or a publication. It is not in accord with our institutions that one man shall be legislative, judicial, and executive all at once as to another's guilt or innocence without a trial and a hearing. The question as to whether a publication should or should not be barred from the mails does not enter into this at all. The objectionable feature is its centering in one man this autocratic and unusual power. It makes an implement for political use of the worst and most deplorable kind. We are a Government of law, not of men.

You can not suppress political discussion and preserve the health of the body politic. Fumes poured into the open diffuse themselves and pass harmlessly away. Part of the present unrest is due to the necessary restraint during the war. Now we are at peace. Our business is to remove the cause for unrest. If these bills were too drastic for war times, then what immense proportions do they assume for peace time? Bottle up an idea, shoot it, martyr it, and you increase it a thousandfold. That is human nature. That is history.

Truth need not fear the light. It is only untruth and half truth that gather strength from darkness. America has existed to these many years and has not fallen, despite the many criticisms and attacks made against her and the changes advocated or instituted. Arguments must be met, not suppressed. There is no inherent danger in argument. Our sturdy Americanism is in less danger from diseased European ideas than if, through hysteria, the servants of the people should be coerced into fastening upon them this un-American thing that in the hands of stupid and petty tyrants would reduce us to the state of Germany and Russia before the terror.

Not so lurking and unheralded, but far more deadly and disastrous a maelstrom menaces us to-day than the maelstrom of 1914. Unrest from deep-seated causes shudders over the country in convulsive waves. Here it takes the form of a lynching mob not satisfied with one victim and trying to hang their mayor. In another place it sweeps out in a riot, where murder ensues, the wrong man is hung, and false reports spread class hatred. Class hatred is the ugly visaged monster we are due to meet. There is a bullheaded blindness about the ones who hold the reins that recalls the saying, "Whom the gods wish to destroy they first make mad."

First of all, the country has been flogged into an hysteria by impostures of false patriotism, by self-constituted guardians, who wrap the flag about them, question the patriotism of others, and put them to the proof. There is an irritating quality to their loyalty that insists on being noticed and is incapable of taking for granted what has always been a sterling and integral part of every American, born and adopted—that love for our native land and our flag that goes without saying, that brooks no insult and is eager to avenge. Unwisdom and unnecessary harshness characterized the whole period. Now, when the air is pregnant with danger, when the clash of interests has been so intensified by the universal greed and selfishness of the profiteer, this bill comes a sinister menace to the sufferers from industrial unrest and to provoke strife and discontent.

It behooves the powers that be to take counsel, to temper their judgments with common sense, and not by senseless oppression of those who do not deserve it or do not come within the intent of their project render the conflagration imminent.

The patience of the people is strained to the breaking point. Profiteering is going on everywhere. Laws made to curb it are set aside at will by Cabinet heads and administration agents. Regulations are a farce. Fair-price committees are an excuse for establishing not lower but always higher prices. Excess-profits taxes, instead of helping bear the vast burden of war expenditure and lifting some of the weight from the shoulders of the masses, are only made the excuse for tremendous orgies of expenditures by every big and little profiteer in the country. Firms who never advertised before take whole pages of expensive advertising. They charge it up to the consumer anyway, and then a smaller profit shows. One firm even bought a great daily newspaper with the purpose of wrecking it because it was a competitor. They feel that now is the time to get rid of competitors and to advertise and build for the future, all at Uncle Sam's and the consumers' expense. Anything to beat the Government out of the hated excess-profits tax. The cruel circle of higher prices, higher wages, goes whirling madly on, to the betterment of no one and to the bewilderment of the poor purchasing class who have lost all hope of relief. Instead of legislation aimed at existing abuses comes this bill which would cure unrest with hangman's nooses. Instead of removing the cause, it

seeks to curb the result. Department heads and the class in this country who favor this legislation are wont to question, thwart, and oppose the will of the majority.

To these the mass of the people is an unwashed rabble, filthy, ignorant, without honor or substantiality; unfit to judge what they want or what is good for them, let alone to govern themselves. They must be ruled, these think, only by and through the superior few. Exploiting the herd they consider imperative to the success of business. They can only conceive of labor as a gang corruptible to their purposes, useful only when it toils, and not entitled to reach above for greater opportunity lest they, the finely bred, the dainty, the exquisite in food and dress and living, be run over and bitten by these creatures, these swarms of ants. They who seek to create caste are the ones responsible for the hatred, the antagonism, which has been fed, fostered, multiplied by the injustice and ill-treatment they perpetrate.

The hateful force has been there long, and they who called it into existence will have to face and answer it. They have had chance after chance to read the handwriting on the wall. But instead of learning wisdom and moderation they only seek at every opportunity to force reaction; rivet cast-off shackles on limbs that have outgrown them. They have within their hands the power, the means, to work out our salvation.

If, by larger visioned response to tortured humanity, they would lighten instead of pile up the unbearable burdens of the masses, where would then be the unrest? But the only answer they make to the ever-increasing rumble of the approaching storm is higher prices, and higher, and yet higher. And now they want a law to hang any American that criticizes them or their puppets in authority.

It must be the strong, whole-souled American spirit, with its honesty, order, and intelligence, that will leaven and sweeten the whole mass. We do not want the dictatorship of the capitalist; we do not want the dictatorship of the proletariat; we do not want the dictatorship of anyone. We want the will of the majority and laws that will give opportunity for all.

The solid body of the people will not permit such yokes to be fastened upon them. They will not be confused, on the one hand, by the glittering specious promises of the agitator, nor, on the other, to be stampeded by the intimidation of the pseudo-patriotic foes of our free American institutions, but will hold steadfast to the course which destiny has intrusted to them.

The liberties of America, the right of free press, free speech, free assemblage, and free religion, the props and pillars of our democracy, are in the balance. You can not tamper with one of our liberties without jeopardizing all the others. They are too indissolubly intertwined.

The battle for democracy is never won. It goes on forever. The Magna Charta of our liberties will be wrested from our grasp if we do not guard it with constant vigilance. It is for us to keep our sanity, nor be excited or frightened by scare-head propaganda. 'Tis but the eye of childhood that fears a painted devil." Because the waves of feeling roll higher to-day than they did in similar period of unrest in history, greater temperance and moderation are imperative.

Americanism must save us.

Our Government is the servant of the people, not the people the servants of the Government. If it is right to say wise things, who shall decide what are unwise things? When truth and error grapple in an open, fair fight, who can doubt the result? Our constitutional birthright is free speech, free press, free religion, right of assembly, and petition of grievances. [Applause.]

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. Fess having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Sharkey, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had, on February 19, 1920, approved and signed bill of the following title:

H. R. 3620. An act to authorize the Commissioner of Navigation to change the names of vessels.

#### LEGISLATIVE, EXECUTIVE, AND JUDICIAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAHAM].

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, on Monday, under suspension of the rules, the House passed H. R. 12507, a bill to authorize the Secretary of War to transfer certain surplus motor-propelled vehicles and motor equipment and road-making material to various services and departments of the Government and for the use of the States. For some time it has been thought by a good many Members of Congress, which thought I shared, that there was a very considerable amount of road-making machinery in the

hands of the War Department that would be available for road-making purposes by the various road departments of the States of the Union. I, in my work on the Expenditures Committee, together with my colleagues, have been to various ordnance establishments over the country and there we have seen at various places large amounts of machinery that might be available for that particular purpose, and I thought that there was a good deal of it to be had for that purpose. I know that the road departments of the various States are depending largely upon this source of road-working material for the next year. Some of the leaders of the majority side I am informed have been trying for some time to ascertain how much of this material there was. Only last week I was in conference with Mr. McKENZIE, at that time working on the bill in the absence of Mr. KAHN, about this bill, and, as a result of that conference, I addressed a communication to the War Department asking that they give me in detail for use on Monday last information as to how much of this material there was. As is usual in such matters there was great delay in answering and I did not get an answer until day before yesterday, after the bill had passed the House, and on that occasion I got the following communication from the Secretary of War:

WAR DEPARTMENT,  
Washington, February 17, 1920.

Hon. W. J. GRAHAM,  
Chairman Select Committee on Expenditures in the  
War Department, Washington, D. C.

SIR: As requested in your letter of February 12, I am attaching hereto an itemized list showing all the items called for in H. R. 9412 in connection with the transfer of surplus material to the Department of Agriculture for the Bureau of Public Roads.

I would call your particular attention to the fact that the figures given are as reported in the latest inventory from the various bureaus and operating services of the War Department. Sales of this material are being made continually, and from time to time additional surplus is reported.

I believe the attached statement will give you the information desired.

Respectfully,

NEWTON D. BAKER,  
Secretary of War.

H. R. 9412 was a former bill that was rewritten as H. R. 12507.

Statement showing the total amount of material surplus as shown by the latest commodity statements of surplus issued and forwarded to the office of the Director of Sales by Ordnance Salvage Board of the Ordnance Department, December 25, 1919; Surplus Property Division of P. S. & T., December 31, 1919; the Air Service, November 30, 1919; the Signal Corps, January 31, 1920; the Chemical Warfare Service, January 31, 1920, of the items which would be turned over to the Department of Agriculture, as provided for in House resolution No. 9412. Quantities given herewith are not permanent, as sales are continually being made on this material, withdrawals from surplus to meet any requirements are being made, and additional quantities are constantly being declared surplus, all of which change these totals from day to day. The entire list of items as provided in House resolution No. 9412 are listed herewith, and where there is no surplus the word "none" is written.

Now, I would like to have you give your attention to this list. It impressed me as so remarkable that I could hardly realize the facts presented by this communication, even after I got it and looked at it.

Air compressor, outfits with power	174
Blasting machines	None.
Boilers	136
Bridge material, fabricated	None.
Buckets, clamshell	None.
Buckets, orange peel	1
Cable, hoisting	None.
Conveyors, gravity	None.
Conveyors, power	None.
Cranes	48
Crushers, rock	1
Culverts, corrugated metal	None.
Derricks	42
Drafting machines	None.
Drill outfits, air	None.
Drill outfits, steam	43
Engines, donkey	None.
Engines, hoisting	1
Excavators, caterpillar	3
Excavators, drag-line	None.
Exploders	1,680
Explosives	None.

Although there are in the warehouses of the country to-day hundreds of tons of T. N. T. and other explosives which might be used, still this list which the Secretary sends me shows that there are no explosives available.

Graders, road	22
Hose, air	feet 5,000
Hose, rubber	do 12,486
Hose, steam	None.
Levels, engineer	None.
Loaders, wagon	5
Mixers, concrete	52
Oilers, road	None.
Pile driver outfits, complete	None.
Pipe, iron	feet 1,616,378
Pipe, steel	None.

Planimeters	None.
Plants, asphalt	None.
Plants, screening	None.
Plows	3
Pumps, centrifugal, with power	None.
Pumps, diaphragm, with power	None.
Railroad equipment, industrial	Small quantity, miscellaneous.
Roofing, corrugated metal	None.
Road rollers	None.
Scarifiers, road	None.
Scrapers, drag, fresno, wheel	3
Shovels, steam	None.
Stump pullers	None.
Tapes and similar supplies and equipment	64
Trailers	101
Transits, engineers	None.
Wagons, dump	20
Wagons, sprinkling	70
Wagons and similar equipment, and supplies, such as are directly used for road-building purposes	4,783
Wheelbarrows	474

Now, gentlemen, you will observe that in this list, which includes, I believe, all the articles that are named in the House bill that we passed, aside from the item of wagons, of which there are about 4,700, there is hardly enough of material for the needs of any one State in the Union. Now, in view of the general understanding that we all had that there was a great mass of this material, in view of the knowledge that we had that in almost every industrial plant of the country where the Ordnance and Construction Divisions were doing business they acquired a large number of these materials, the question arises in the mind of any man as to what became of the material.

There are only two things that could happen. One is that these articles have not been declared surplus by the War Department, and the other is that they have been disposed of in some way. I do not know whether the Members are familiar with the method that is pursued in declaring machinery or other articles surplus. It is this in brief: The General Staff has provided a mechanism in the War Department by which they decide on a certain program, and they say how many of a certain kind of thing must be kept for the needs of the Army which they are planning upon, and then before anything can be sold the salvage department or sales department must refer the matter back to the procurement division and have them O. K. it before it goes through. So that ultimately the War Department agency that sells this material must have the consent of the official who bought it, and in that way, if those who originally purchased it had any tacit or implied understanding with the manufacturer that this stuff was not to go back on the market, of course they can stop the sale of it by withholding their assent to having it declared surplus. In some cases I am satisfied this private arrangement existed. In my judgment, there is an immense mass of stuff in the country in these establishments that ought to be declared surplus, but it has not been done. And I think it entirely fitting and proper that some action be taken by the Committee on Military Affairs of this House, that has jurisdiction over that matter, by which some affirmative action may be taken requiring the War Department to give to the Congress an inventory of the amount of this kind of stuff they have in the country, so that Congress can determine for itself whether it is advisable to keep all of it off of the market and in these various establishments. But that is not the whole answer to the proposition. A lot of it has been frittered away and gotten rid of with very little financial return to the Government.

Some time ago I made a few remarks in the House with reference to Nitro, W. Va. I do not want to burden you with that thing, but I want to call your attention to what we discovered when we went out there as to this kind of machinery. You will remember that plant cost us \$70,000,000 in cash. We sold it recently for \$8,550,000 to a number of Charleston gentlemen who are holding it, I assume, for the purpose of investment and speculation.

Mr. KEARNS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Yes.

Mr. KEARNS. Has the land on which this plant was constructed been paid for?

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Not entirely; we have not title to a part of it yet.

Mr. KEARNS. It was taken from a number of farmers there?

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Yes.

Mr. KEARNS. Have any of them received any money at all for those farms?

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Some of them have, but as yet the Government has not title to several tracts on that reservation, unless it has been acquired very recently.

Mr. KEARNS. I will say to the gentleman that in the Anchor nitrate plant, located near Cincinnati, they took 1,800 acres, and none of those men have received a cent.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. I may say, just in brief, about that Anchor business, that in my judgment there are ample funds in the hands of the War Department available out of which the people who gave the land at the Anchor plant can be recompensed. There is general law for that, without any independent legislation. There are funds there to pay them, and they ought to be paid, and the only reason they are not paid is that the War Department does not pay them.

Mr. KEARNS. Why do they not?

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. I do not know.

Now, let me tell you of the plant at Nitro. They sold that plant for \$8,550,000, payable in installments in about 10 years. Only about \$350,000 in cash has been received by the Government. There was over \$9,000,000 of inventoried property there when the sale was undertaken. In addition to the \$9,000,000 worth, approximately, of property, there was conveyed in that sale to these gentlemen a lot of machinery, such as in discussion here, and they have it now. I have here a list of contractors' equipment, quite a large pamphlet, that has a large list of this road-working machinery. This is a list of what we conveyed to these gentlemen at Nitro, W. Va.:

4 back fillers; immense number of parts.  
Blasting equipment—3 batteries, large number of caps, large amount of fuze, 10 boxes dynamite, 140 kegs black powder.  
27 clamshell buckets; large number of parts.  
115 carts.  
Large amount concrete tower equipment.  
16 crabs and winches.  
14 cranes and immense number parts.  
35 derricks and immense number parts.  
3 Gin. poles.  
4 graders.  
10 tar and pitch heaters.  
183 hoes.  
69 hods.  
28 scaffold hooks.  
30 hoists and large number parts.  
210 ladders.  
7 loaders and immense number parts.  
45 concrete mixers and immense number parts.  
6 mortar mixers and immense number parts.  
Large amount pile-driver equipment.  
31 plows and large number parts.  
2 windlasses.  
1,238 wheelbarrows.  
1,432 trench braces.  
1 trenching machine; immense number parts.  
1 posthole digging machine and parts.  
2 rock crushers and large amount equipment.  
8 road machines.  
47 rollers.  
1 road gauge.  
168 scrapers.  
96 slings.  
1 steam shovel and large number parts.  
4 street sweepers.  
143 concrete tampers.  
38 tractors, mostly caterpillar, and immense number parts.  
Large number motor parts.

These hoists above referred to had engines attached to them. Most of the tractors mentioned are caterpillar tractors of the most recent type.

Now, gentlemen, all these things were conveyed in that one sale where these gentlemen at Charleston bought this plant, and I am advised from the best sources of information that most of these other ordnance establishments around over the country that are being disposed of are having lumped in with the other equipment an immense amount of this road-making machinery, that is being given away practically for nothing, while the States of the Union are expecting Congress to provide for them by letting them have this machinery. When we come to the place where the law has been finally passed through the Congress we will find that there is nothing to give under it.

Mr. GOODYKOONTZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Yes.

Mr. GOODYKOONTZ. Is it not a fact that whereas the War Department has sold this immense plant and property for about \$7,000,000 they are still keeping on hand down there numerous governmental employees, and that one of these employees is drawing a salary of \$50,000 a year?

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. The manager for the Charleston Improvement Co., a man who before he was employed there was working for the Red Cross for nothing, as I remember, is now getting \$50,000 a year to run that institution. They are acting as the agents of the Government in the disposal of the plant, and I assume that ultimately the Congress will find that the \$50,000 a year is taken out of the expenses of conducting the sale of that property down there.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I was very much amused by the remarks just made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAHAM], chairman of the Committee to Investigate Expenditures in the War Department. I was very much impressed by the information which he conveyed to this House. That information consisted principally of propounding questions to the House as to things that he supposed were transpiring in the War Department about which he said he had no information. Gentlemen on his side of the House for many, many months have been clamoring because it was said that the War Department had on hand great masses of all kinds of material which ought to be disposed of and turned back into the useful lines of commerce. They have been demanding by resolutions that the Secretary of War be required to sell such products, and after the resolutions have been adopted and the Secretary of War is notified that such articles must be disposed of the gentleman from Illinois comes back into the House and makes a complaint here because the Secretary of War has on hand so few of the very articles which he and his committee have been declaring should have been disposed of. They have been denouncing the Secretary of War for his neglect in not selling supplies and now condemn him for having on hand too little.

I would like to say to the gentleman from Illinois that if he really wants to serve the Government of the United States, I would suggest to him that his committee, clothed as it is with extraordinary powers, would do well to summon witnesses, to compel their attendance, to produce books and papers; that his committee will better serve its purpose if they busy themselves with finding out some of the things that he is always inquiring about on the floor of this House. If the gentleman from Illinois and some of his colleagues would exhibit the same zeal in really finding out facts that they exhibit in their orations upon the floor of this House and in their interviews in the public press, if they will talk more with witnesses and less with reporters and political press agents, the gentleman from Illinois, instead of coming on the floor of this House and making inquiries and propounding interrogatories to us, would be able to impart to this House some information.

I, for one, as a Democrat on this side of the House, earnestly and sincerely hope that if the committee investigating war expenditures find any crookedness, any criminality, or wrongdoing in the War Department, the committee will report the facts to the district attorneys throughout the land and to the Federal grand juries, and that they will pillory at the bar of public opinion those who are guilty of that wrongdoing. But I want to suggest to the gentleman from Illinois that no useful purpose can be subserved by coming on the floor of this House from day to day simply finding fault, or rather making reports without suggesting action, as the gentleman's committee did some time ago; that such action can serve no purpose except to inflame those minds who are abroad in the land who are already preaching that the Government has done all the things that are wrong, and that this existing system of ours is topsy-turvy and is ready for an industrial or social revolution.

Of course, gentlemen of the minority and the majority both well know that in the prosecution of a great war waste is inevitable. There can be no escape from extravagance when a great, busy agricultural and industrial people turn their activities from the ways of peace into creating a great war machine. When we lay aside our usual occupations and, under the press of necessity and under the spur of hurry and of speed, divert our activities into making war machines, of course there is going to be waste and extravagance and inefficiency. And I want to say to the gentlemen on that side that that is not a condition that is unusual or peculiar to the war that has just come to an end. Even during the war for our independence such was the case; it was so during the Civil War, and in a lesser degree it was so during the Spanish-American War. Those conditions existed. But as the result of this Great War we hear now, throughout the land, talk of unrest, social unrest, industrial unrest.

I do not believe that we are in any danger of any serious disruption of our political or social system. We hear people talking about social revolution, and repressive measures are suggested as a remedy. I am not alarmed by that. I do not believe that we are going to have revolution. If anybody contemplates revolution let them start something, and the American people and the American Government will take care of that situation.

when it arises in a manner that will leave no doubt that the United States is an unhealthy place for anarchy. I believe it is all talk and buncombe. But I do want to suggest that reports and statements of the character made by the gentleman from Illinois a little while ago are not calculated to reduce the tension under which the people of the United States are now laboring. I am not hostile to the gentleman or to his committee. I trust that they will go out and find out something, and if anybody has violated the law, prosecute them.

If any crooked work has been done over at Nitro, W. Va., for God's sake go to the grand juries and tell them about it. I assume the sale of the property at Nitro, about which the gentleman complains so loudly, was conducted in accordance with law. I assume the property was advertised for sale. I assume everybody had an opportunity to bid on it. I know nothing about the proposition; but if anything is wrong about it I challenge the gentleman's committee to take those steps which are provided by law for the bringing of the guilty parties to justice. The assumptions of legality and regularity always exist until overcome by contrary proof. The gentleman's committee was appointed to secure such contrary proof, if it exists. Gentlemen on that side would have complained bitterly if the plant had not been sold. Now that it has been contracted for sale they are equally displeased at the sale.

Mr. KEARNS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. KEARNS. What I was complaining about was that the people who owned this land in West Virginia and Ohio for these two nitrate plants had their land taken from them. They were forced to move from the land, and they have never received any money for it. That is what I was complaining about. Does the gentleman know why they have not received any compensation for the crops that were destroyed and for the lands that were taken?

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not know why, in the particular cases, but I will say to the gentleman from Ohio that if any of them resided in my State or district I should find out about it. I have had no occasion to investigate that situation, but if the gentleman from Ohio can not find out the information I commend him most heartily to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAHAM], who has at his command an instrumentality for bringing even the Secretary of War before his committee and putting him on the stand and asking him, "Why have not you paid these people out in Ohio and West Virginia for their land?" The gentleman well knows that under the Constitution those citizens are guaranteed compensation for whatever of their property may have been taken from them by the Government.

Mr. KEARNS. I have asked the Secretary of War about this some half dozen times in the last year, and the Secretary of War has never told me how any of them can get their money.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will tell the gentleman that one reason why they have been delayed so long in getting their money is that the gentleman's party on this floor last May, the moment it got into power, was so afraid that the Secretary of War would do something wrong that it passed through this House an amendment to an appropriation bill providing that no portion of money theretofore appropriated in the various appropriation bills then in force should be used by the Secretary of War in payment for land or for camp sites and things of that kind; and, while I do not know the particular facts in the case which he is inquiring about, I will say to the gentleman from Ohio that if he will investigate the matter, no doubt, he will find that that alone was an insuperable impediment to whatever action the Secretary of War might otherwise have taken.

Mr. KEARNS. I will grant that the Republican Party was responsible for that part of it.

Mr. CONNALLY. All right.

Mr. KEARNS. But the Secretary of War and the Democratic Party were responsible for the other class of claims, those of tenants who were raising crops on this land—as we call it, on shares, getting a part of the crop. This crop was taken from those tenants—not the land, but the crop.

Mr. CONNALLY. I understand.

Mr. KEARNS. And they have never received as much as a nickel. How can the gentleman excuse the Secretary of War for that?

Mr. CONNALLY. The gentleman from Ohio should go down to the War Department. If he will do that he will find, as a part of that organization, a number of claims boards whose duty it is to adjust claims of that character. Within the very recent past I have had occasion to inquire about claims pertaining to another Army camp, and I found those claims were in the course of liquidation, and that a great number of them had already been settled and paid.

Mr. KEARNS. But none of them at Anchor, Ohio, have been paid?

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not know about Anchor, Ohio. I do not know about those particular cases, but I would recommend to the citizens of Anchor that they ask their Congressman to go down and investigate those cases and bring them to the attention of the Secretary of War.

Mr. KEARNS. They have been brought to the attention of the Secretary of War a dozen times.

Mr. CONNALLY. I can not discuss any particular case, because I do not know the facts. It may be that those people out at Anchor, Ohio, want more for their property than they are entitled to receive.

Mr. KEARNS. No; they do not.

Mr. CONNALLY. It may be that their claims have not been presented in the manner required by the regulations of the War Department. I am not acquainted with the facts of the case, and can not, of course, answer as to them.

Mr. KEARNS. They have had three different investigations by officers sent from the War Department to this city to investigate those claims. On three different occasions the owners of this property—that is, of the crops that were taken—and the officers representing the War Department have agreed as to the amount that was due. The first agreement was a year ago. When the claims were presented the Secretary of War said he had no funds out of which to pay them.

Mr. CONNALLY. Of course the Secretary of War is not responsible for the lack of appropriations. That is the fault of Congress, of which the gentleman's party is in control. I would suggest to the gentleman from Ohio that if he has constituents whose claims have been adjudicated by the War Department and the amounts of those claims have been fixed, and the Secretary of War can not pay them because he has no funds, that the gentleman communicate with the steering committee on his side of the House and with the Committee on Appropriations and get an appropriation to pay these claims.

Mr. KEARNS. But we all know that he does have funds.

Mr. CONNALLY. Oh, well, I can not yield any further.

Mr. KEARNS. Just for this one statement.

Mr. CONNALLY. All right.

Mr. KEARNS. When the contract was made at Anchor for the furnishing of materials by some corporation, 50 per cent of the value of the property to be delivered was paid before it was ever delivered. Now, if the War Department can find money to pay for property before it is delivered, why can they not find money to pay for the land and the crops that they have taken?

Mr. CONNALLY. Of course, that is clear. Of course, after the Secretary has spent an appropriation he can replenish it from some unknown source! The gentleman can imagine that while he might have had an appropriation, he may have exhausted the appropriation in purchases or payment of claims. Because he paid out 50 per cent of it to somebody is no reason why he has got the other 50 per cent.

Mr. KEARNS. They are paying for property that is being delivered there to-day. They have found some money to pay for property.

Mr. CONNALLY. The gentleman from Ohio contradicts himself.

Mr. KEARNS. No; I do not.

Mr. CONNALLY. First he says they have not been paying for property, and now he says they are paying for it.

Mr. KEARNS. Property delivered to go into buildings and ordnance and other things delivered there.

Mr. CONNALLY. In reply to the gentleman I can not tell about the various claims in the War Department. Of course, different kinds of items are provided for in separate appropriations, and one fund may be exhausted while another still has a balance. I commend the gentleman to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAHAM], who has at his beck and call a committee with inquisitorial powers that can get the information which the gentleman desires. I trust that he will get accurate and correct information, and if he does he will find that the Secretary is ready to pay those claims which have been adjudicated, if he has funds. But I want to suggest the fact that the claimants in Ohio had to have three investigations before they were able to fix the amount, and that might be said to be one of the reasons why they have not been more promptly paid.

Mr. KEARNS. Each one of the investigators agreed that the farmers whose crop had been taken should have a certain amount.

Mr. CONNALLY. What made them send back twice three officers to settle the claims which had been settled by the first board?

Mr. KEARNS. I do not know; they rejected the first and second.

Mr. GARRETT. If the gentleman will yield, let me say that the reason that the claims have not been paid is that there was a provision put in the sundry civil bill, passed in the extra session of Congress, which in a way repealed prior legislation and prevented the War Department from paying these claims.

Mr. KEARNS. That was for the purchase of land—I am talking about the payment of these claimants for crops.

Mr. CONNALLY. I beg you gentlemen not to go away saying to yourselves that I am making a partisan speech. I am not. I trust that the committee will really find out the facts, will lay them before this House and before the American people, but I am awfully tired, as I am sure Members on that side are, of this eternal growling and grumbling about things which the committee does not seem to know much about. If there is anything wrong, for God's sake turn the light on and put the wrongdoers on the rack, but do not come here like a garrulous and quarrelsome old woman with the rheumatism, continually growling and whining about the War Department. You know, as I must know, that the War Department of this Government was called upon to perform a task which in its proportions was never equaled in the history of the world. [Applause.] You know it if you know anything. You know that the little organization we had in the way of an Army, with all of the immense expansion entailed by the emergency, with the inefficiency of civilians called from civil life to take up new duties, could not function perfectly and properly in every particular. I declare that the story of the War Department in that great struggle and its achievements reads like the moving chapters of an enchanted tale. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. Sisson. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHERWOOD].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague [Mr. IRELAND] may have permission to extend his remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] asks unanimous consent that his colleague [Mr. IRELAND] may have permission to extend his remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHERWOOD] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say just a few plain words on a subject that I consider of vital moment, and that is the question of some bonus for the soldiers of the World War. On the 9th of November, 1919, I introduced a bill to give a \$500 bonus to these soldiers, and I understand a number of such bills have been introduced.

Shortly after that the American Legion met in national convention in Minneapolis, and they failed to indorse by official action any of these bills. There are in all four organizations of World War soldiers—the American Legion, the Private Soldiers and Sailors League, the Veterans' Legion, and the Rank and File. Later the national committee of the American Legion met at Indianapolis and changed the attitude—if they had the power to do so—of the former decision of the league. For this reason Congress is not to blame for the delay in considering relief legislation.

#### DO IT NOW.

Reports are now coming from all over the country—and I am getting letters from Maine to California—demanding a bonus. I do not know why they should write so many letters to me, probably because of the fact that at one time in my life I had the honor of being a soldier. I believe there is real merit in this claim for aid to our World War soldiers, and whatever is done ought to be done now.

After the Civil War, which was of four years' duration, in which we had from first to last 2,212,272 soldiers enlisted, the Government did nothing for our soldiers. I bear witness that in the Forty-third Congress, in the winter of 1873-74, Gen. James A. Garfield, then the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, afterwards President of the United States, made an address on this floor, in which he stated that the total appropriation for pensions for the soldiers of the Civil War that year was only \$26,000,000. We received no substantial recognition at all until 14 years after the war was over. This neglect imposed great hardships upon the discharged veterans.

I submit a letter which is a fair specimen of the letters I have received. It is in the Toledo Blade of February 18. This soldier saw real service overseas:

If the American Legion is not going to make a political issue of the mistreatment of soldiers, both in the service and after their return home, when they were insulted with the mere beggar's hand-out of \$60, then I ask of what use is the American Legion? What is it organized for?

I served 23 months on 6 fronts, and was in 2 drives—Argonne and Ypres. I am not a crab, but wish to express my views, as I have the right to. Can any fair-thinking citizen say we received a fair deal? Had we 100 per cent efficiency in the management of the Government instead of about 40 per cent efficiency we could have received a much higher bonus, and it would have cost the Government much less to prosecute the war at that.

I see many of our boys are still wearing their uniforms. Probably have never since they got home had money enough to buy a suit. One big trouble is that the people can't visualize what soldiers went through in the war. If they could understand, they would hang their heads in shame at the measly \$60 we were presented upon our return.

#### REDUCE THE ARMY TO A PEACE BASIS.

According to reports the Military Affairs Committee of the House has provided for a Regular Army in time of peace of 250,000 men and about 18,000 officers. This is the largest army ever before organized in peace times. Why not reduce this Army of wasteful idlers to a rational military force and give to our victorious soldiers a substantial relief measure? That will not only show the Nation's gratitude, but will appeal in duty and justice to every patriotic citizen. If Congress will reduce our Regular Army to a sensible peace basis, we can then give to every honorably discharged soldier of the World War a bonus of \$500 without increasing one dollar the aggregate appropriation for the Army and Navy, as now proposed by the Military and Naval Committees of the House and Senate.

#### WHY UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING?

All lovers of peace will regret in sorrow that the important Military Committee of the House of Representatives has indorsed in the Army bill, by a vote of 11 to 9, a provision for universal military training. According to the estimate made by the leader on the Republican side of the House, we are liable to squander \$900,000,000 on this worse than useless project at a time when there is a universal demand for production of the necessities of life in order to reduce the high cost of living. Taking the farmers' boys away from the fields, the laborers from the shops, and the miners from the mines in order to build up a military autocracy in this country is criminal idiocy. All this in imitation of the deposed German Kaiser and the imperialistic monarchies of the Old World.

#### LINCOLN'S VIEW OF MILITARISM.

The stars never looked down upon a more deplorable spectacle than Europe presents to-day. And the country that inaugurated universal military training and a universal preparedness for war—the German Empire—is realizing in universal ruin the inevitable result of imperialism and militarism—twin devils of greed and brutality. And shall the United States imitate the fatal mistakes of the former German Kaiser? Every patriotic American with brains enough to think says "No." Shall our stalwart young men be taken from the peaceful pursuits of profitable industry and have their well-directed energy and ambition turned into destructive pursuits? In the language of Abraham Lincoln, fix their plastic minds "upon the exceeding brightness of military glory; that attractive rainbow that rises in showers of blood; that serpent's eye that charms to destroy."

Restored production is absolutely essential to normal economic conditions. Hence to take our stalwart young men from the farms and shops and mines to join the great array of non-producers and idlers, now in the nonproducing class, and add \$900,000,000 burden to the bent backs of the taxpayers is an utterly indefensible policy.

#### WHY PREPARE FOR WAR?

Why is it to-day, when we are at peace with all the world and burdened by a national debt that staggers belief, that we should again prepare for war? How utterly idiotic is the idea that any foreign European nation, exhausted in fighting men, with business and industry paralyzed, loaded down with a debt that can not be paid, with its lands filled with millions of widows and five times as many fatherless children, with 6,000,000 maimed and crippled soldiers—legless, armless, sightless, and insane—who have escaped from the damp pity of the trenches and lurid hell of battle, are going to make an impossible crossing of 4,000 miles of ocean with an army that is impossible to equip or transport and attack 120,000,000 people of the United States between whom there is no quarrel.

#### JEFFERSONIAN DEMOCRACY COMMENDED.

The hour is due to strike the death knell of militarism and imperialism. The hour has come to call back the Republic of our fathers to its own. The hour is at hand to cast off the greed of empire and return once more to the plain simplicity of Jeffersonian democracy. Let us hope and pray that in this epoch-making year a second Jefferson will arise, inspired with the same irrepressible genius of democracy, and redeem this Nation from imperialism and militarism and vampirism now sucking drop by drop the lifeblood of a great, brave, patient people.

## RECOMMENDS OLD-AGE PENSIONS.

The uppermost and most vital question before Congress to-day is how best to deal with the acute conflicts between capital and labor and to appease the general unrest. In my judgment an old-age pension law, while not a sovereign remedy, would prove a valuable aid.

I introduced an "old age" pension bill in January, 1916, and have reintroduced this bill in this Congress. The United States is the only great country around the world, except Russia, that has failed to enact legislation for the care and comfort of its worn-out workers. The men and women of the shops, mines, and farms, who produce all our wealth and who have made this the richest Nation around the world, are treated with total indifference after their working days are over and turned out to frostbitten grass and cold neglect like a worn-out dray horse. And yet our orators and statesmen call this the only great Republic on earth, where the people—the plain people, if you please—have the rule and destiny of the Republic in their keeping. Nothing would do such valuable service in healing the constant conflicts between capital and labor as a system of old-age pensions, such as an English Province, under an English King, inaugurated way out on the broad Pacific Ocean. Not only would this benign alleviation of the woes of the workers heal the antagonism now so apparent in labor strikes, but it would be an inspiration of patriotism to every worthy worker in the United States. Our flag would then be a hope and a symbol of helpfulness, saying to every son of toil be true, be faithful to your trust, and when old age comes on apace this flag with the shining stars will be your protector and a grateful Nation will help you to make your last days on earth comfortable and full of gratitude. As a matter of national defense, it would be a cogent inspiration to every worker.

Under our form of government, with all power not conceded to the Federal Government reserved to the States, it is not within the jurisdiction of Congress to enact contributory old-age pensions. Hence my bill is based on the system successfully adopted in New Zealand. How generously or how justly have we provided for the benevolent succor of our great army of industrial workers after their working days are over? Is the proposition to take care in their old age of the men and women whose industry and skill made this the richest Nation around the world to be given no serious consideration, when the leading monarchies of the Old World have made this humane legislation the basic idea of their economic policy?

## OLD-AGE PENSIONS IN FRANCE.

The law establishing a universal compulsory system of old-age insurance for workmen and employees in France was enacted in March, 1910, and promulgated in April of that year. The law is an extension of the law of July 14, 1905, which established a right to relief on the part of all persons over 70 years of age.

The old-age pension law of Great Britain provides in brief that every British subject of 20 years' standing and residence in the United Kingdom who has attained the age of 70 years and is without a yearly income in excess of £31 10s. (\$157.50) shall, on application, receive a weekly pension ranging in about 1s. to 5s. To the continental island of New Zealand belongs the credit of being the first country in the world to establish a straight-out old-age pension system.

After the subject had been agitated about two years an act was passed in 1898, going into effect on the 1st of November of that year, which provided for the payment of old-age pensions out of the general revenues of the Government to persons duly qualified under the law, without contributions from either the beneficiaries or employers. This pension is fixed at \$130 per year for laborers of either sex over 65 years. The first State of the Commonwealth of Australia inaugurated old-age pensions in 1901. Later, in 1908, the Commonwealth Parliament established old-age pensions for all the old worn-out workers in this great continental island, ranging as high as \$260 a year.

Belgium: Pensions are paid at the age of 65 years, after 30 years' service, or in case of physical disability after 10 years' service.

Holland: Pensions are paid to all employees reaching 65 years of age, or for disability after 10 years' service.

Sweden: Pensions are paid at the age of 65 years after 35 years' service.

Switzerland: Each of the 22 Cantons has a different civil-pension system. Teachers are the only federal employees who are pensioned.

Turkey: After 30 years' service a pension may be claimed if, through sickness or bodily infirmity, the employee is unable to attend to the duties of his office.

Egypt: A service pension may be claimed after 25 years' service. All employees are retired by law at the age of 65.

Japan: Pensions are paid after 15 years' service, beginning at one-quarter of the salary and increasing one two-hundred-and-fortieth for each year of service over 15. Any official may retire at the age of 60 years.

Even big railroad corporations, that are said to have no soul, have inaugurated old-age pensions. The Baltimore & Ohio was the first railroad in the United States to grant a pension to superannuated workmen. This was in 1884. The Chicago & North Western Railroad inaugurated an old-age pension in 1900, pensioning employees of 30 years' service who reach the age of 70 years 1 per cent of the average monthly pay. The Lake Shore, the Pennsylvania, and other trunk lines have adopted service pensions for faithful employees when their days of usefulness are past, all based on merit and long service. We have bills before Congress that are meritorious pensioning the old and faithful clerks who have served the Government for a quarter of a century. My bill makes no distinction between the faithful and long-service employees of the Government and the faithful and long-service workers who do the world's work and produce the world's wealth in our mines and factories and fields.

The following important railroads have adopted the old-age pension system: Chicago & Northwestern Railroad, the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railroad, the Delaware & Lackawanna Railroad, the Houston & Texas Central Railroad, the Illinois Central Railroad, the Oregon Short Line, the Pennsylvania Railroad, the Philadelphia & Reading Railroad, the Rock Island System, the Southern Pacific Railroad, the Union Pacific, the New York Central Lines. All together these trunk lines aggregate 45 per cent of the entire railroad mileage of the United States. They provide for a liberal pension on the retirement of their faithful employees. Nearly 1,000,000 men are employed. They provide, on an average, a pension of 30 per cent of the salary of the employee for the past 10 years. Retirement is permitted at 65 years and compulsory at 70. No contributions are required from railroad workers.

## WHAT THE FLAG STANDS FOR.

Did it ever occur to you that a national flag is chiefly valuable for what it stands for? The flag of a Republic like ours is typical of the Nation's purpose, in the line of justice, equality, and the humanities. The purpose of a people or a nation are only reflected in its laws. Humane legislation is the surest inspiration for loyalty of the men and women who do the world's work. Let us recognize the claims of the industrial classes in the speedy passage of alleviating laws. This would inspire a more sympathetic admiration for the flag and a deeper devotion to our best ideals of democracy than unmeaning flag waving and skyrocket oratory, exploiting extravagant armies and navies, and domination of the big oceans. This bill is constitutional and meritorious, and if enacted into law will appease and mollify the acute conflicts between capital and labor now threatening our industrial life. It will do more to mollify the conflicts between capital and labor than all the labor laws of the past. It will not only give hope and comfort to our great army of wealth producers but will place this Nation on a par in benign legislation with the hereditary monarchies of the Old World.

## WHY COMPULSORY MILITARY SERVICE?

England had just abolished compulsory military service. Compulsory military training and compulsory military service are yoked sinister evils, absolutely hostile to democracy. Are we less democratic than Great Britain under a hereditary King?

At the close of our great Civil War Gen. Grant, then the foremost soldier of the modern world, approved the muster out of all the volunteers, reducing our standing army to 25,000 men. There was a powerful and aggressive element in the North clamoring for a war with England. During the war Confederate cruisers, built in English shipyards and armed in English arsenals, had driven American commerce from the seas and oceans of the world, but President Grant favored the Geneva court of arbitration.

Lord Morley, in his life of Gladstone, says:

The treaty of Washington and the Geneva arbitration stand out as the most notable victories in the nineteenth century in the noble art of preventive diplomacy and the most signal exhibition of self-command in two or three of the great powers of the western world.

At Appomattox Grant stood on fame's topmost pinnacle the foremost man in all the world, but in the Geneva award he was greater than at Appomattox. [Applause.]

## WHY NOT PREPARE FOR PEACE?

We are to-day at peace with all the world. Why should we prepare for war when we have never had a war in over a century and a quarter of national life that was not of our own seeking? No nation on either side of the Atlantic has ever attacked us when we were numerically weak.

We are at peace with all the world. Let us strive, as becomes the citizens of a Christian nation, to make that peace perma-

nent and perpetual. Let us put aside all thoughts of gun and sword as unworthy our traditions and history and look to a future wherein the flag of our shining stars of States shall be a beacon light beckoning our people to peaceful pursuits and social and moral betterment. The great present, with its glowing zeal for humanity, with a culture deepened and broadened by science and enriched by all history, with its strong-winged soul of prophecy hot and glowing with blood beats of a realized brotherhood of man claims us and calls us to stand by the ancient faith. [Applause.]

It is the verdict of universal history that no military nation was ever a moral or progressive nation. Peace is constructive, war is destructive; peace means prosperity and progress, war is hell and uproar.

## APPENDIX.

The following letter from a devout disciple of the lowly Nazarene is a trifle radical, but has some illuminating opinions on a pair of noted historical characters:

OBERLIN, OHIO, February 21, 1920.

HON. ISAAC SHERWOOD.

DEAR SIR: For several years it has been my wish and intention to write you to express my admiration for the attitude you have taken on various occasions on important public measures and questions.

When our country was rushed into the infernal World War, contrary to the earnest wish of the overwhelming majority of our people, and it was announced that the House had voted, I said, "First of all, I want to see the roll of honor," and I saw your name among the fifty or so noble men who had stood out against the prevailing madness. I took note that you had served in our Grand Army for the defense of the Union, a cause that demanded the enthusiasm and devotion of every true patriot and every real American. I also took note of several other interesting facts—that Elihu Root, who had been roaring for war and wanted to punish anyone who was not in favor of war, that Mr. Root was 19 years old when the Civil War began, but he never offered himself or lifted a finger in defense of his country in those trying times. Also, that Joseph Choate, former ambassador to England, who was unceasing in his efforts to crowd us into the war for defense of his beloved England—that Mr. Choate had been 26 years old when the Civil War broke out, and that he, like Mr. Root, made no move to come to the defense of his country. Also, that in one of those Eastern organizations for pushing our country into the war, like the National Security League, made up largely of old men, the only one who had come to the defense of his country in the Civil War was Mr. Putnam. I also noted that Senator Works, who voted against our going into the World War, had been a patriot and had enlisted for the defense of his country at the age of about 17 years, and served till the end of that war. One could comment at great length on these and similar facts.

I am a Presbyterian minister and far from being a socialist, but I note with pride and satisfaction that recently you had the spirit of old Americanism sufficiently to cause you to vote against the exclusion of Victor Berger from the House of Representatives. The reactionary measures that are being pushed and the acts of oppression and suppression that are being taken in our country are making socialists by the thousands, and will make hosts of men much worse than socialists.

Very respectfully and sincerely, yours,

(Rev.) HENRY A. TODD.

BENJAMIN FRANKLIN QUOTED.

Benjamin Franklin, the leading scientist and most thoroughgoing patriot of the Revolutionary epoch, said:

Freedom of speech is a principal pillar of free government; when this support is taken away the constitution of a free society is dissolved and tyranny is erected on its ruins.

MR. SISSON. I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

MR. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I hope I may be allowed to proceed without interruption, and I wish to say in the beginning that I will not yield to interruptions during the short time I have.

I would not intrude upon the time of the committee this afternoon but for the fact that on account of the very limited time that has been granted for debate on the conference report on the railroad bill I will be unable to get very much time then. Therefore I have sought this opportunity to give expression in a meager way to what I think about the conference report as a general proposition.

I have never in my life seen a bill reported by any committee of Congress or reported by any conference committee that was as big as this bill or that contained as many provisions as this bill contains, with which I agreed in toto. I do not agree to this bill in toto. In other words, I do not agree with every provision in this bill.

But conscious of my responsibility here as a Representative at this time, who intends to do what he conceives to be his duty regardless of threats that may come from the outside, regardless of the threats that may come from any organization, either among the owners or among the employees of the carriers, conscious that whatever action I may take and whatever vote I may cast will be subject to criticism and subject to being misunderstood; believing and knowing that something must be done in this situation between now and the 1st day of March or chaos and bankruptcy will occur in one of the greatest of all

of our industries, I am going to vote for the adoption of this conference report to-morrow. [Applause.]

The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUDDLESTON] to-day made a speech here upon this floor that would have been proper probably in some places, but certainly it was not proper to be made here. It was an appeal that should have fallen upon deaf ears in a body like this. When a man gets up here and all the argument that he has to make against the adoption of a bill by this House is to try to throw fear into its Members by saying that they will be misunderstood and defeated if they vote for it, it were better that he had not spoken here. [Applause.]

Last night over in the majority room of the House Office Building occurred a most remarkable meeting. Sentiments were expressed there by men outside of Congress, and some inside, that I had hoped would never find their way into this Capitol. There was talk of the autocracy of capital. There was talk of Members of this Congress being swayed because they are afraid to go in the face of capital. They preached against this bill and against what are called the labor provisions of this bill. Every man in this presence, every man in this country who understands the situation, knows that it is not the labor provisions to which Mr. Gompers and his organization object. [Applause.] No man or set of men in America to-day can write a bill for the return of the railroads to their owners that Mr. Gompers and the other labor leaders will indorse. [Applause.] They want the Plumb plan. They want a two years' extension of Government control. And why do they want a two years' extension of Government control? It has been hard enough for the House committee and the Senate committee and the conference committee to unscramble the situation which has existed as long as this has.

These men know that if this situation goes on and if the railroads are held in Government control for two years more, it means what they are after, which is Government ownership, and Government ownership only. Has it come to pass in this country that the free representatives of a free people can be scared by the threat of Mr. Gompers or anyone else who represents less than 5 per cent of the people of this land? The fear that would come to me would be to vote against this bill and to have this riot of waste go on for two years more. [Applause.] I believe, my friends, that the time has come in this country when the people who are free and who intend to remain free, who sent their sons to the battle fields of France, there to bleed and die that autocracy in Europe may be destroyed, are going to see to it that the 95 per cent of the people of this land rule it, and not the autocracy of the 5 per cent. [Applause.] The issue is going to be joined pretty soon. This is only one of the threats with which we have come in contact. A few years ago, when we had up the antistrike provision before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I heard Mr. Gompers make the defiant declaration that if that committee reported that bill and Congress adopted it, he served notice on them in advance that he would violate that law. Surely after making such a declaration as that he can not be considered a wise and a sane leader. [Applause.]

There are some things in this bill that I do not like, but there are so many things in it that are vital, that are necessary, that I can not meet my responsibility as a Representative here and vote against the bill.

The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUDDLESTON] said the railroads say that they need something, the conference committee say that they need something, but labor does not need anything. All they ask is that the Government keep the railroads for two years; that the public does not ask anything in this matter and that it is only Wall Street that asks for favors in this bill. Then he went on to say, "I have already demonstrated to you and convinced you that nothing needs to be done."

He did not convince any sane man who had ever studied this question, who had intelligence enough to understand it, that something must not be done. Every man who understands this situation, every man who has studied this question, knows that if the railroads go back to private ownership on the 1st day of March without additional legislation, within 90 days all the railroads, with the possible exception of three or four, will either be in bankruptcy or in the hands of receivers.

If I know anything I know that the people of this land are sick and tired of Government operation of the railroads, which has brought a higher rate, placed millions of additional debt on the backs of an already overburdened and tax-weary people, and which has given us a service poorer and more inefficient than we have ever known before.

The cost of material has gone up; labor has been increased practically a billion dollars. If the railroads go back to private ownership on the 1st of March without anything having been done the prewar rates will go into effect and war wages will remain in effect.

Much complaint has been made about the guaranty provisions in this bill. I would rather it could have been worked out otherwise. My primitive opinion and my primitive prejudices are against a proposition like that, but my judgment is a judgment of the cloister and not a judgment of one who is put up against the real situation and those who may have some understanding of that situation.

Those of us who live in the sparsely settled sections of the country where there are few railroads, where we know that in the past five years not a thousand miles of railroads have been built in the whole country, where we need railroads, where we need efficient service, know that if the Interstate Commerce Commission sets a rate under which the Union Pacific and the Santa Fe can make only a fair per cent on the value of their property, those small roads will starve to death.

They serve communities and they should not be torn up and these communities not be allowed to prosper and not have service. If we set a rate that will make a fair return on the investment of the capital of weak roads, then the Union Pacific and roads of that character will get an unreasonably high return. I say I do not like the guaranty feature, I do not like the name of it, but I have not got anything better to offer at this time. Have you? You who are going to vote against this bill, do you have anything better to offer? Do you want either one of the two bills that have been introduced and urged before our committee as a substitute? Do you want the two years' extension of Government control introduced by Mr. SIMS, of Tennessee? Do you want the Plumb plan as introduced by Mr. SIMS? Do you want the Government to bond itself for \$20,000,000,000 and turn over to the employees of the railroad all the railroads in the country to please Mr. Plumb and Mr. Gompers?

This bill as much insures and as much guarantees that the rich roads shall not receive more than a certain amount as it guarantees that the poor roads shall receive a reasonable amount. It takes off from the rich roads and insures that the poor roads will amount to something.

I want to call the attention of gentlemen of this committee who are in the sections of the country that have the short-line railroads that there has never been a time since railroading first began when the short lines, the originating lines, have been done justice. The trunk lines to which they have been feeders have handed out to them in the division of freight a small amount—many times and most of the time upon a mileage apportionment—and anyone who has ever studied the question knows that the short line or originating carrier can not live on a mileage basis in the division of freight.

This bill says that hereafter a mileage basis shall not be the controlling factor in the division of rates between the originating carrier and the trunk line, and that the Interstate Commerce Commission is given power to make a division that may take care of the roads that originate the traffic, the roads that go out into virgin territory and develop our land, roads that are as essential to the life and prosperity of the country as the trunk lines. That is one provision I would ask you who live in the far West and many sections of the South to think well of before you vote against the bill.

Gentlemen here say that when the value of the railroads is set, poor securities and watered stock will enter into the value, and yet when you vote against this conference report you will vote against the only bill you have got a chance to vote for that will bring about a house cleaning among the railroads. This conference report contains practically word for word the bill that we passed in this House in 1914, with practical unanimity, known as the Rayburn stock and bond bill, which says that hereafter before any railroad of this land shall issue any new securities, put them on the market, it shall come before the Interstate Commerce Commission and under oath set forth the reason why it desires this issue, and before it can issue and put on the market these securities the Interstate Commerce Commission, a capable governing body, must itself pass upon the question. When you vote against this bill you vote against a law that will cause this house cleaning among the railroads, that will cause the railroad securities, instead of being hawked around as watered stock and as spurious securities, to stand for value and mean something.

No one in the future can say that railroad stocks and bonds are "wind and water" as has been the case too often in the past. Not only shall the issuance be supervised but after the stocks and bonds are put upon the market and sold the commission has the power to call the railroads' managers before them and have proof made that the money was spent for the purposes set out in the application for authority to issue the securities. It seems strange that the men who at present are the loudest in their

talk about watered stock should be opposing a bill in toto which carries this most necessary feature and which will cure the very evil of which they complain.

Some argue against this provision that it will take away from the State commissions their right to control these issues and say that it is a violation of the rights of the States. I, too, stand for State rights, and I contend that my State, that has had an efficient stock and bond law for many years, has the right to be protected against the States that have no such laws. I would also call the attention of these gentlemen to the fact that the convention of State railroad commissioners of the United States have indorsed over and over again this very measure which insures that all stocks and bonds shall be regulated and also insures that there shall be uniformity.

Many other provisions of this report I would like to discuss, but my time is too limited to permit.

Men talk here of a guaranty for six months. All that we do in this bill is to extend the standard return for six months, which time it will take the Interstate Commerce Commission to work out a new rate structure.

Government control and operation of the railroads has been a costly and in many ways a bitter experience. It has cost the Government many million dollars a month more than the revenues of the roads to keep them going. Before this experience many good men were drawn to the belief that there was virtue in Government ownership. But this experiment has cured them. If the millions that we have lost in this business had demonstrated to these misguided, although patriotic and otherwise thoughtful, citizens the futility and insanity of Government ownership, the money has not been lost entirely in vain. It demonstrates a truth as old as man—when the laws of health are violated the violator will suffer for it. When governing powers violate a fundamental economic policy, the penalty must also be paid in fullest measure. It is the business of government to regulate and govern business, not go into business.

Mr. Chairman, this is only one of the many measures that I want to see passed in this and the succeeding Congress. I want to see all of these war powers repealed and the Government get out of these expensive and socialistic businesses. I want to get back to normal. When these matters are attended to then I want to see our Americanization law strengthened. I believe in an America for Americans. This country is too small for any man or set of men who pay allegiance to any other Government or any other flag. This is no place for the man who violates our law—be he high or low, rich or poor. The anarchist and the Bolshevik shall go. This is a mighty good country because 99 per cent of the people, regardless of section or party, are good citizens and loyal. And when a crisis comes, they will stand together. When the red hand of anarchy and lawlessness is thrust toward the throat of liberty, patriots will forget their differences.

But back to the question of this report. Yes, it is easy to vote against a bill like this. Many provisions will be criticized. If I were willing to shirk my responsibility and wanted to go in the path of least resistance, knowing that many provisions of this bill will be criticized and that I would be asked why did you pass this, why did you pass that, and why did you pass the other, I could excuse myself very easily by saying that I voted against the whole bill.

But realizing the situation we are now in, knowing that it is going to be destructive if legislation is not passed before the railroads are returned to private ownership, I can not, feeling as I do, take upon my shoulders the responsibility of not being willing to share here with my fellows whatever responsibility there comes in passing upon this question and solving it as I believe for the best interests of all concerned. [Applause.]

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

Mr. MONDELL. In connection with the consideration of this legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill I want to express my appreciation of the splendid work done on the bill by the members of the committee, and particularly the subcommittee. The Members on both sides have worked earnestly and faithfully on this very difficult piece of appropriation legislation. There is not an appropriation bill which comes before the House which is quite so intricate and difficult as is the legislative bill. It involves the fortunes of a very large number of people and relates to many and diversified portions of the public service, and when the time arrives when we must greatly reduce estimates on such a bill, the committee that has the matter in charge has as hard a problem before it as can possibly be placed before any legislative committee. I am certain that the subcommittee

and the full committee performed their duties with an eye single to the public interest, and all of the members of the committee are to be congratulated. If they have made any mistakes, they are mistakes of the head and not of the heart. I think the bill as a whole, and practically all of its items, are entitled to the favorable judgment of the House.

Mr. Chairman, in connection with the discussion of the Indian appropriation bill, the first appropriation bill to be considered this session of Congress, I briefly reviewed the financial situation and expressed the opinion that whatever else we might do, our one compelling and paramount duty was that of practicing strict economy in the appropriation and expenditure of the people's money.

I called attention to the fact that this was not only essential in order to avoid financial difficulty—possibly financial disaster—but that, in view of the fact that extravagant public expenditure is one of the most potent causes in advancing living costs, it was important to economize in Government expenditures in order to help reduce the high cost of living.

In this connection I expressed the opinion that we should, in making our appropriations, reduce the estimates carried in the Book of Estimates in excess of a billion dollars, and stated that in order to do this it would be necessary to accomplish an average reduction of about 23 per cent in the appropriations as compared with the estimates.

We have now progressed far enough in our appropriation program to be able to forecast the probable outcome, and I am very glad to be able to say that we have up to this time, and including this bill, met our expectations in the matter of reductions.

This is the seventh of the 13 regular annual appropriation bills, and when this bill has passed the House we shall have, as to the number of bills, more than half completed our appropriation program for the year.

On the appropriation bills which have thus far been reported to and considered by the House, excepting the bill for the Post Office Service, which is approximately self-supporting—to wit, the Indian, rivers and harbors, Diplomatic and Consular, Agricultural, Military Academy, and legislative—we have effected a saving of a little over \$66,000,000 below the estimates, or a little less than 25 per cent. As these bills include several on which the suggested average of reduction was not anticipated, the showing made is even better than we had expected.

On the bill now before us the reduction below the estimates amounts to nearly \$19,000,000, or approximately 15 per cent. The reduction below the appropriations for the current year amounts to about \$23,500,000. This is certainly a splendid showing when we take into consideration the fact that this bill provides, in the main, for salaries, and that the only saving that can be made is in the number of salaries to be paid.

The reduction is very marked when we take into consideration the fact that this bill contains several large and unusual items, such as upward of \$42,000,000 for the Bureau of Internal Revenue for collecting taxes and enforcing the provisions of the national prohibition act, nearly \$11,000,000 for the Bureau of War Risk Insurance, and \$5,000,000 for the expenses of the Fourteenth Decennial Census. These three items, totaling upward of \$58,000,000, are in amount considerably more than half of the total carried in the bill.

I take advantage of this opportunity to again emphasize the importance of economy. We must reduce the estimates by upward of a billion dollars or we shall increase the floating, unbonded indebtedness; and even though we accomplish this reduction, which I am quite certain we shall, it will be of no avail if outside of and beyond the estimates we make enormous expenditures.

We can not increase our floating debt without inviting disaster, we can not issue bonds for investment purposes without greatly reducing the present value of outstanding Government securities and threatening the stability of our specie basis, and we can not issue bonds in small denominations which would become a part of the circulation of the country without inviting all of the disasters above enumerated and the additional calamity of tremendously increasing the cost of living through the expansion of the circulating medium.

Economy to the limit and no new obligations, unless they are accompanied with provisions to raise the sum required by taxation, is the only sound basis of action.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, I now yield one minute to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. GOODYKOONTZ].

Mr. GOODYKOONTZ. Mr. Chairman, I wish also to extend my felicitation to the Committee on Appropriations for the work they have done on this bill. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting an editorial from the *Wheeling (W. Va.) Intelligencer*, written by Mr. Herschel C. Ogden, a brilliant newspaper man.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing the editorial referred to. Is there objection?

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, have we not established a precedent of not publishing these editorials in the RECORD? If gentlemen desire to have them reprinted in the newspapers for circulation in their districts, it is easy enough to have that done. I regret very much to do this, but as the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], who usually looks after that sort of thing, does not seem to be interested, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS].

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I do not want the occasion to pass without speaking a word of approval of the high standard of statesmanship taken a moment ago by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN]. He speaks from a judgment that is well matured, out of a mind that is clear in its conceptions, and with a heart that is courageous—qualities that are very much in demand at this time, so far as legislation is concerned.

I want now to address myself for a few moments in comment upon a remarkable statement, made by probably the highest authority on military affairs in our country, in respect to the physical defects of the youth of the country as brought out in the draft findings. I read from a statement that I think is astonishing, although it is common knowledge.

I read from a speech of Gen. Wood, April 12, 1919:

The last mobilization—in fact, the entire mobilization for this war—showed a very alarming condition, so far as the physical condition of the men of our country is concerned. The standards under the draft were dropped very low, and we took perhaps in the neighborhood of 70 per cent. Only about one in five, or about 20 per cent, would have passed the physical examination required for the Regular Army or the marines in time of peace. In order to get men for the war the bars were lowered very materially. Of the men who came certain racial groups presented very heavy percentage of physical deficiencies. Some racial groups averaged 83½ per cent unfit for services because of vice diseases. Others ran from 8 to 12 per cent. In addition to this condition of unfitness, bad enough in itself, but infinitely bad when you think of its effect upon the population as a whole, and remember that this condition was found in those who were considered fit to send down to the camps—and when you remember that you can imagine what the condition was in the thirty-odd per cent who were not fit to send—were certain other conditions.

Among the men who came we found no end of physical defects which could have been thoroughly corrected or prevented by sound physical training in early youth. We had all kinds of deformities, such as curvatures, humped-up shoulders, hollow chests, pigeon chests, distortions of various kinds, flat foot—all things that, if properly looked after earlier, could have been avoided. There were a great many cases of seriously defective teeth, with resulting digestive disturbance. In fact, the draft showed an almost entire disregard, so far as our people as a whole are concerned, of sound physical training and of remedial training in early youth. The vast majority of these boys who came to us could have been made fit for military service if they had had any kind of supervision early in life.

If you can teach boys to stand up straight, and give them the habit of deep breathing, not having them overdo in muscular exercise, but taking just enough to make them alert, giving them those exercises which develop quick coordination, real coordination of mind and muscle, when we get them then it is a very easy task to train them in military work. But of the men who came to us during the war no end of them were heavy of foot, slow in coordination, and clumsy in gait, and it took months of real hard work to make them nimble, active men. There is nothing mysterious about military training. It is very simple and very quickly accomplished with the private soldier when he gets a perfect physical specimen.

Members of the House will recall the sensation created when these results were given out by the recruiting officers. They became the subject of wide discussion upon almost every education platform, whether the pulpit or forum. People were undertaking to find the source of these defects, whether it was a mere matter of neglect, something that could have been avoided, and there was a campaign started as early as the middle of 1917 to stimulate public sentiment for a higher and better physical training of the youth of the land. The recruiting officers' report shows that there were defects in about 75 per cent of the applicants. Gen. Wood stated that not one in over five was received, which would be about 20 per cent. The draft records show that 37 per cent were totally rejected. The officials testify that fully one-half of the time spent in training in the camps was spent in conditioning the men in order to whip them into physical form ready for the training that would become necessary later on.

Nobody questions the value of training. Nobody would, I am sure, refute or attempt even to controvert the value of athletic activities, which we find throughout the high-school life, the college life, and the university life. There is a question which is very pertinent and that is being discussed widely now in respect to military training, but I do not think there would be any dispute on the value of physical training if it could be brought within the compass of the schools of the

country. I am convinced that in high-school life and in college life there is no activity that means more for the esprit de corps and the upbuilding of the physical body, as well as the mental, than do the athletic exercises that are to be witnessed in the various contests carried on, whether in competition or purely for training effect. I have always said that if the school authorities could fix a standard of learning as a qualification for entry to these physical exercise, so that no one could play on a football team or a basketball team or take part in any of the athletic contests who did not bring himself up to an intellectual standard, it would be the mightiest stimulus to keep the intellectual standard up that the college could devise. I am sure that the greatest moral force that the schools of the country of to-day can exercise is to hold out as requirement to entry into athletic contests a standard of manhood and womanhood, and to establish that anyone who falls below the required standard shall be denied entrance into the contests. I think it is the most powerful moral influence in a contest to see one strike the line hard or meet another line coming just as hard, and at the same time not lose one's temper, realizing that this is the hard knock that comes in the play of life. It is a powerful stimulus of moral discipline that will sustain one in the struggles when he gets into real life.

As to the value of military training I do not now wish to speak. That is a point that is widely discussed, and variously discussed, and as to which there is a wide divergence of opinion. During my college days I had the opportunity to weigh the value of mental discipline assured by training under orders. I know of nothing which cultivates the power of attention in a greater degree. I know of no training which produces greater mental alertness which demands immediate execution the moment the command is given. These mental attributes are admitted.

However, these and other mental and physical advantages do not necessitate the Nation's entrance upon a system of compulsory military training at this time.

Personally I am not averse to the effect individually it has upon the party receiving the training.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. I will yield to my friend from Texas.

Mr. GARNER. Considering the gentleman's experience in reference to high schools and colleges, would he consider the military training in those schools detrimental to their success and work in educating the youth of the country?

Mr. FESS. I would not agree to place military training in the high school. I am very much opposed to that. If we are to have compulsory military training, it will have to be by officers under the Government, outside of the school, in order to provide training under proper orders of all our youth and not limited to those who are in the schools. And I am perfectly frank to say to my friend that I can not look with favor upon compulsory military training at this time at all. There are reasons quite specific that I could offer against it. But this is what I am concerned about, that if 75 per cent of the flower of the country that were taken into the camps were found to have physical defects that might have been removed, it is up to the States and the Government to prevent those defects in childhood. That is the thing I have in mind.

Mr. WINGO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. I yield to my friend.

Mr. WINGO. Along the line the gentleman suggests, is it not true that flat feet and defective teeth and other defects of that kind, more often than otherwise, grow out of neglect in the early childhood and before children reach the age at which it is proposed to give them military training?

Mr. FESS. That is absolutely true, and high military authority holds these defects unnecessary if proper care in youth is observed.

I would say to the membership of the House, waving aside the military question about which there is much discussion, as well as general interest, I am absolutely convinced that either the States individually or the Nation, or both in cooperation, ought to set about to correct what was revealed by the draft records in the examination of our boys. It would seem to me that wisdom demands that there must be at once an effort made that will be operative in all the schools of the country to indicate to boys, for example, how to stand erect, how to breathe correctly, how to carry the body, how to go through the manual training—in a word, how to develop the physical body. There ought not to be any neglect that would cause persons to grow up with stooped shoulders if it could be avoided. There ought to be a stimulus upon every child, boy and girl, from early youth that should induce the National Government to cooperate with the States to insure a strong physical body, so that if we should ever get into a crisis where we should have to have sol-

diers we would have strong, physically fit young men. It would not take long to put them in shape to meet what the war would require. This is attested by every consideration of reason and by the experience of all close observers. But if we permit the persistence through childhood of these physical defects, then we shall have the same problem and one can imagine how much it is going to require to take a physically defective boy and make out of him a strong soldier. That is the thing I hope we may in some way or other avoid by providing against the defects by a system of education carried on in school age by both State and Nation.

Mr. DONOVAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. I yield to my friend.

Mr. DONOVAN. The thought occurred to me as to whether or not in some of the cities now there is provision made for attention to these defects in the public schools.

Mr. FESS. There is in a great many schools. This work in many cities has attracted the country. I will introduce a bill this afternoon, and I do it with the clearest conception of the great burdens upon our Government under which we are now suffering, and I will introduce it with the sharpest interest in economy, for I am frank to say that I am one of the Members of the House, and there are many on both sides, who will not hesitate to take the step to avoid any unnecessary expenditure; and I introduce it with the full understanding of the demands of the hour, for if we continue the unnecessary expenditure foisted upon us in behalf of winning the war we are destined to see the cost of the Government, which was \$1,000,000,000 annually before the war, continue three and one-half times that—and none of us wants to do what will produce that result—but with this in my mind I will introduce a measure this afternoon looking to the authority of the States and the Nation supplying physical training to every boy and girl from the age of 6 to 18 in order to make impossible these physical defectives that grow up right under the shadow of our schools as now conducted. This expenditure can be properly enacted as an economy measure.

Mr. EVANS of Nevada. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FESS. I yield to my friend from Nevada.

Mr. EVANS of Nevada. Does the gentleman feel that a small corner in one of these departments could furnish adequate information to the various States for them to act upon and bring it nearer to home and have it more practical? Do you feel that that would be efficient?

Mr. FESS. There is some objection, as there always has been, to the Government entering upon anything of this sort, and the objection goes to this feature, that education is a matter for the States. But the gentleman knows how I feel about that. I do not believe that the States without the stimulus of the Federal Government are going to do the work that is required. The appalling facts revealed recently show the need of education not yet afforded. We have entered upon Federal cooperation and education to remove certain disabilities in the way of ignorance. The land-grant college, the Smith-Lever Act, the Smith-Hughes Act, and the Fess-Kenyon bill all are examples of Federal cooperation with the States. The disability in the way of a physically defective body is apparent and is quite unnecessary, and I think the Government is justified in entering upon a campaign of cooperation to remove that disability.

Mr. MILLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. I will.

Mr. MILLER. I want to say to the gentleman from Ohio that I am in perfect sympathy with his proposition, but for the purpose of information I would like to ask the gentleman under what clause of the Constitution it is possible in an educational way, of which the gentleman speaks, for the United States Government to compel the education of the youth of the land along the lines indicated? I understand perfectly how he could do it under the Army clause of the Constitution, but I am asking for information how it could be done otherwise.

Mr. FESS. I will have to be perfectly frank and say that so far as the authority under the Constitution is concerned this Congress could not step over into Ohio and compel by a Federal law the adoption by the State of any particular education, but I am sure that there is no doubt that the State of Ohio could make, as a part of its compulsory educational law, physical training possible, and then the Federal Government could go to the extent of saying to the States, "If you accept the condition, we will make a contribution." [Applause.]

The bill is drafted on the lines of the Smith-Hughes Act, except it places the administration of the act under the Bureau of Education rather than the Federal board.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired, and the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

For compiling the Navy Yearbook for the calendar year 1919, under the direction of the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, \$500.

Mr. GOODYKOONTZ. Mr. Chairman, I desire to renew my request for unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the manner referred to a few moments ago.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks by incorporating an editorial referred to. Is there objection?

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, what is the editorial about?

Mr. GOODYKOONTZ. It is in reference to economy. I asked unanimous consent a while ago and the gentleman from New York [Mr. CALDWELL] interposed an objection, but he afterwards sent for the paper and read it, and has withdrawn his objection.

Mr. WINGO. Is the gentleman authorized to speak for that side in reference to putting in editorials in regard to economy or false economy? If we permit one class of editorials, we must permit others. My only desire is to protect the RECORD.

Mr. GOODYKOONTZ. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks a while ago, and incidentally mentioned that I desired to incorporate an editorial.

Mr. WINGO. No other Member has, while I have been on the floor, asked to put in newspaper editorials, as I recall. I am not objecting if the gentleman in charge of the House is willing to go on record as putting in newspaper editorials. I have many of them which I have been requested to put in, and which I will later ask consent to put in.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The editorial is as follows:

#### CUT EXPENDITURES.

Adolph Lewisohn, New York banker, in a letter urges the reduction of national taxation. If economies can not be made at Washington sufficient to allow the lowering of present tax rates, Mr. Lewisohn believes a moderate short-time bond issue should be made and taxes lowered thereby. The present heavy tax rates of the Government make for waste and for wild speculation. It is suggested that workmen deliberately cut down their earning capacity in order to avoid the income tax. One thing is certain, many corporations earning liberal profits regularly plan to spend money in speculative and semispeculative enterprises as a means of reducing their payments to the Government.

While a bond issue would temporarily lower taxation, the real cure is in departmental economy. We must not only lower taxes but we must spend less money. The Government at Washington to-day is a monumental example of extravagance and inefficiency. It is costing the American people approximately \$60 per man, woman, and child in the entire country. The average family of five is paying \$300 a year, or practically 20 per cent of the earning capacity of a well-paid workman, to help keep Washington going. Twenty cents out of every dollar earned by the American people is taken to feed an army of officials, wastrels, and vagrants. If we have not the courage and the intelligence to stop this shameful condition of affairs, republican government is a failure.

Let the economies begin at Washington.

Let national expenditures be brought down to a sane basis.

Let a half million or more useless officeholders be turned loose to work in gainful occupations.

Let us do away with a myriad of useless commissions.

Let us get away from the idea that the National Government must interfere with, meddle with, disturb, and direct the daily life of the people at every point.

Let us, in short, have a return to sanity and to reason.

The Clerk read as follows:

Office of Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper: Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, \$6,500; Assistant Sergeant at Arms, \$2,500; Assistant Doorkeeper, \$3,600; Acting Assistant Doorkeeper, \$3,600; 2 floor assistants at \$2,500 each; messengers—4 (acting as assistant doorkeepers) at \$1,800 each, 36 (including 1 for minority) at \$1,440 each, 1 \$1,000, 1 at card door \$1,600; clerk on Journal work for CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, to be selected by the Official Reporters, \$2,800; storekeeper, \$2,220; stenographer in charge of furniture accounts and records, \$1,200; upholsterer and locksmith, \$1,440; cabinetmaker, \$1,200; 3 carpenters, at \$1,080 each; janitor, \$1,200; skilled laborers—4 at \$1,000 each; laborer in charge of private passage, \$840; 3 female attendants in charge of ladies' retiring room, at \$720 each; 3 attendants to women's toilet rooms, Senate Office Building, at \$720 each; telephone operators—chief \$1,200, 4 at \$900 each; night operator, \$720; telephone page, \$720; press gallery—superintendent \$2,500, assistant superintendent \$1,400, messenger for service to press correspondents \$900; laborers—3 at \$800 each, 34 at \$720 each; 16 pages for the Senate Chamber, at the rate of \$2.50 per day each during the session, \$4,640; in all, \$147,860.

Mr. ROUSE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting two letters on bills introduced by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] on second-class postage.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing two letters on the subject of second-class postage. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing a letter from Gen.

ISAAC R. SHERWOOD, of Ohio, to the Private Soldiers' and Sailors' Legion, dated July 20, 1919.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing the letter referred to. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The letter is as follows:

#### HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Washington, D. C., July 20, 1919.

MARVIN GATES SPERRY.

President Private Soldiers' and Sailors' Legion.

National Headquarters, 810 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have introduced a bill in the House of Representatives to allow the private soldiers and sailors of the Great World War to incorporate as a fraternal organization. This bill, if enacted into law, will give the men who stood behind the guns and did the real heroic work of war the right to form a social and fraternal society under a national charter of rights.

This fraternal society will not only inculcate patriotic sentiments among the rank and file of the Army, but will remind the present generation (often too prone to forget) that the country owes a debt of gratitude to these gallant soldiers that can not be paid by flag waving or rationless public parades. It calls for practical patriotism.

Practical patriotism was well voiced by the martyred Lincoln in his last inaugural address, "To care for the soldier who bore the brunt in the battle front, his widow, and his orphan." The above is not a literal quotation from Lincoln's last appeal to the American people, but it vitalizes his appeal in spirit and purpose.

Several fraternal societies were organized after the Civil War, of which the Grand Army of the Republic is now the most numerous. The officers organized a more exclusive society, the Loyal Legion, on the plan of the Order of the Cincinnati, organized by Gen. Washington and the officers of the Army of the Revolution. Hence, there is nothing new in the plan proposed by this bill, to form a Private Soldiers' and Sailors' Legion for the commendable purpose of uniting in one fraternal body the men who fought the greatest battles in all history, and who gave added prestige and glory to the heroic achievement of our armies in former wars.

"Lest we forget," these men offered their lives, their hopes for a career, their all in the terrible crucible of battle.

During the Civil War I held six different officers' commissions, but I look back with more self-satisfying pride to my service as a private soldier carrying a gun at \$11 a month in West Virginia in the first battle of the war—Phillippi. The private soldiers of the Civil War did not form a society exclusively of private and noncommissioned officers for the reason that both officers and privates were made up almost exclusively of volunteers.

We were neighbors, both officers and privates, when we went into the war, and all on an equality as citizens and comrades. And when on the battles' front we did not part with that equality. When the private soldiers stacked their guns after a drill or a battle and the officers sheathed their swords, we associated together in camp or around the bivouac fires as social equals.

During the World War officers were regarded as a distinct class and private soldiers were made a subordinate class, whether on or off duty. In our Civil War a private soldier who showed high soldierly qualities in the trying ordeal of battles was booked for promotion. We had no grammar school for officers in order to qualify them to command. Our war demonstrated the fact that while knowledge of military tactics and discipline are necessary qualifications of an officer, that the one vital test is the courage to stand fire in the hot hell of shot and shell, and to hold the mental alertness, the cool judgment, and calm poise in this terrible environment.

If there is now some prejudice among the private soldiers against their officers it is largely on account of this new system of military training, that put schoolmaster-trained officers over private soldiers, who had no battle experience, and giving the men who stood behind the guns no favoring chance to earn promotion by real merit or heroic conduct in actual conflict.

Hence, I say in all candor and with a judgment based upon an experience of some 42 battles, that I hail the private soldiers and sailors of this World War with my most fervent prayers for a successful mission to make fraternity and real comradeship a living, vital element in their future lives, with the hope that they will so live that a grateful people will approve their conduct and example. Furthermore, that they will not have to wait a quarter of a century to receive practical recognition of a Nation's gratitude as we, the veterans of the Union Armies, were compelled to wait. Now is the fitting time to express national gratitude.

Yours,

ISAAC R. SHERWOOD, M. C.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### LEGISLATIVE DRAFTING SERVICE.

Section 1303 of the "revenue act of 1918" is repealed on and after July 1, 1920.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the item.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the item.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Well, I make a point of order against it.

Mr. MADDEN. All right.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. The point of order is it is not in order in that it is legislation. I suppose the idea of the committee was that it was in order under the Holman rule, but it is not.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. That is our contention.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. If the committee makes that contention I would like to be heard, but it is up to the committee to present their views first as the burden of proof is on the committee.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I think it is sufficient to call the attention of the Chair to the fact that the law as it now stands provides--

That there is hereby created a Legislative Drafting Service under the direction of two draftsmen, one of whom shall be appointed by the President of the Senate, and one by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, without reference to political affiliations and solely on the ground of fitness to perform the duties of the office. Each draftsman shall receive a salary of \$5,000 a year, payable monthly.

The provision of this bill to which a point of order is raised abolishes these two offices, in consequence showing upon its face that it will save to the Treasury of the United States \$10,000 a year. In addition to this, to pursue this statute further, it will save the incidental expense.

Now, as I understand it, under the Holman rule any amendment is in order if it is germane and has for its purpose the reduction or retrenchment of expenditures. If it is patent upon its face that it will retrench expenditures, it is in order.

I wish to state further that it would not even be necessary for it to appear that the amount was specific, or that any considerable amount might be saved. If it appears upon its face that any amount is saved, it is in order under the Holman rule.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. GARNER. Under the gentleman's contention, if I understand it correctly, a provision inserted in an appropriation bill which repeals any statute now in existence that costs the Government money to maintain its activities under the statute would be in order; so that you could repeal the entire statutes of the United States, provided thereby you would save money.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. No. That is not the contention at all. The repeal of the legislation would displace a specific office. There are many statutes that could not be repealed by that means.

Mr. GARNER. Under that reasoning the gentleman could repeal the whole criminal code. Any statute now existing that required a salaried officer to perform a certain duty could be repealed in that way. There is no difference, whatever the performance might be. You could repeal, I repeat, the provisions for the entire criminal code of this country by an item on an appropriation bill, which is absolutely illegal. I am sure that the gentleman does not mean by that that he can repeal a statute because, forsooth, by the repeal of that statute he discontinues an office and thus saves money.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. No; that is not the contention. It is the contention of the chairman of the committee that under the Holman rule, where a provision simply abolishes a specific office, it is clearly in order if it shows upon its face a retrenchment in the expenditures of the Government.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT. It has been some time since I looked at the Holman rule, and I can not find it just at this moment. My recollection is that the provision in the Holman rule which undertakes to make legislation in order that retrenches expenditures provides that that legislation shall be offered by a committee having jurisdiction of it if introduced as a legislative proposition. I do not mean that is the exact language of the rule, but that it is the idea of the rule. Now, the Committee on Appropriations would not have jurisdiction of a bill repealing this act if it were introduced as an independent proposition.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I think the gentleman is in error. It is a good deal broader than the scope he is giving to it.

Mr. GARRETT. That is one phase of it.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I refer the gentleman to page 361 of the manual. The gentleman is right with reference to the fact that that is one of the reasons; but if it appears on any general appropriation bill that the effect of the legislation proposed will retrench the expenditure of money, it is germane where it is for the purpose of abolishing an office.

I wish to invite the attention of the Chair to a ruling made by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] when the question was up with reference to the abolishment of the Subtreasuries, and, by the way, that question will arise again during the consideration of this bill. In that ruling of the gentleman from Virginia he uses the following language:

There is no effective proposition to reduce the amounts covered by this bill for the obvious reason that the reductions which the repealing provision will effect will not of necessity occur within the life of the bill, which is limited to a duration of two fiscal years. There is another feature, however, of the paragraph which has apparently been overlooked, and that is the reduction effected in the number of the officers of the United States.

The effect of this legislation is the reduction of two officers of the United States, and the gentleman from Virginia, basing his reasoning upon that fact—that it would reduce the offices of the United States and thus retrench the expenses of the United States—held that provision repealing the law creating the Subtreasuries of the United States to be in order. If it was in order

then, it certainly would be in order now. I think the rulings are uniform upon that proposition, that where the legislation is for the abolishment of an office of the United States, and by reason of the abolishment it will retrench the expenditures of the Government, it is in order.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WOOD] cited some ruling that I have heretofore made in this connection. The reasoning of that ruling was good then, and I think it is good now for any state of facts to which that reasoning applies. But the trouble that confronts both the gentleman from Indiana and the committee reporting this bill, is that the present situation is different from the facts discussed in that ruling.

There are two difficulties with respect to this particular amendment. One is that under the recent rulings this rule is to be construed strictly. I know that is the attitude of the gentleman in the chair [Mr. LONGWORTH], because in an argument with me on the floor a few days ago he contended that this rule ought to be construed strictly, stating that he was opposed to legislation upon appropriation bills, and that there was great danger in affording a liberal construction of the Holman rule, whereby legislative riders could be engrafted upon appropriation bills. That is this situation. This is a legislative rider pure and simple, not related or germane to the subject matter of this bill, and not belonging to the jurisdiction of this committee.

The rule with respect to Holman amendments providing new legislation is that they shall be germane to some provision of the bill, and shall show upon their face that they will reduce expenditures. See Manual, Edition 1918, page 373. The gentleman from Ohio and myself argued that proposition in the case to which I have referred. There is absolutely nothing on the face of this bill, or on the face of this particular paragraph that gives any information in this respect. There are many precedents to the effect that you must look to the bill, and to the amendment in order to gather from them that a reduction will be effected. These precedents should be followed, if the Holman rule is to be construed strictly, and not liberally.

I will cite these decisions in a moment. But the far more material difficulty in the way of the gentleman from Indiana is that if the Appropriations Committee undertakes to report a bill containing legislation and a reduction, both the legislation and the reduction must be germane to the subject matter of the bill and retrench expenditures in one of three ways.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Let me ask the gentleman, is not the abolishment of this draft committee just as germane when it comes in from the Committee on Appropriations on the legislative bill as was the abolishment of the Subtreasury when it came in on the same kind of a bill?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. That may be.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. As I understand it, the question involved at the time the gentleman from Virginia made the ruling referred to was the abolishment of the Subtreasury of the United States, not at a specific time but at a very remote and uncertain time—six months after the close of the war. That is correct, is it not?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Nobody at that time could tell when the end of the war might come.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. That decision may or may not have been sound, but if it sustains the gentleman's contention, I intend to cite per contra a number of decisions not made by the gentleman from Virginia, but reported in the Manual.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I presume, then, that this is more a matter of expediency than otherwise?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. No; it is a matter of proper ruling.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I take it for granted that the gentleman from Virginia in making this ruling was convinced that he was ruling correctly with reference to the enforcement of the Holman rule?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I will agree to that.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Here is another thing to which I wish to call the attention of the Chair. At that time the gentleman from Virginia was carrying out the policy of his party in retrenchment of the expenses of the Government. He is not so much interested in that proposition now, but that is one of the things for the Chair always to take into consideration, and if there was any doubt upon this question, it should be given a liberal construction in favor of the reason for its invocation.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Personally I think and have always thought that the Holman rule ought to be given a liberal construction, but that has nothing to do with the question raised by my second objection.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. The amendment proposed at the time the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] made this ruling was for the purpose of retrenching expenditures. That was the reason given for sustaining the proposed legislation, and in that case it was a very uncertain proposition. The point of order might have been sustained in that case clearly, I think, because of the uncertainty of the proposition. No one could tell whether the war was going to end in 1 year, or 6 years, or 20 years.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Suppose we concede that I was mistaken in that ruling.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I do not believe the gentleman will be willing to concede that.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Yes; I will concede that pro arguendo.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. For the purposes of this case the gentleman has indicated that he is willing to admit now that he was wrong then. But this is not the only decision upon this proposition. There are numerous cases which the Chair will remember very well. One of them was decided also by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS], if my memory serves me right. That was with reference to the reduction in the Army when it was proposed to reduce the Army by 10 regiments of Cavalry. There was nothing in the proposed legislation that would indicate upon its face that it would save the Government a dollar. Yet it was perfectly reasonable, and the gentleman was justified in assuming that 10 regiments of Cavalry could not be maintained by the United States Government for nothing, and that the very fact that it was going to reduce an instrumentality which meant an expenditure for its upkeep made it germane and made it proper legislation under the Holman rule.

The same thing was held by Mr. ALEXANDER with reference to the abolishment of the Subtreasuries the very next year after the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] held that the legislation proposing to abolish the Subtreasury was germane. Mr. ALEXANDER adopted not only the ruling of the gentleman from Virginia, but quoted at considerable length in approval of the reasoning in his decision.

If other precedents were desired with reference to this proposition, I call attention to the well-decided case with reference to the Pension Office, where there were just two words which indicated that it was going to reduce the number of those who were entitled to receive pensions, without showing upon its face that it was abolishing even any statutory office.

But because of the fact that it would result in the retrenchment of expenses under the Holman rule it was held competent. Here it is competent to take into consideration that fact as it was there, and the only change of existing law is the abolishment of two officers, thereby saving the Government the expense of their salaries.

Mr. STEENERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. STEENERSON. What part of the bill is this provision germane to. There is nothing here to which it is germane.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes; there is.

Mr. STEENERSON. If there was something in here providing some reference to the war-revenue act or to section 1303, it might be germane.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. It provides that "section 1303 of the revenue act is hereby repealed"; that is sufficient.

Mr. STEENERSON. No; it is not referred to in this bill.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. It carries it into the bill by reason of the reference. The Chair will have to take judicial knowledge of the fact that there is such a section as 1303 of the revenue act.

Mr. STEENERSON. In regard to what the gentleman said about the ruling on the Subtreasury there was a clause in the bill referring to the Subtreasuries but here there is nothing in the bill to hang it on.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I may have been mistaken in my ruling in the Subtreasury case. But I was not mistaken in the ruling on the amendments to the Army bill for the reason that the Committee on Military Affairs had jurisdiction both to legislate and to appropriate. The point I am now making, and I wish to state it clearly and cite ample authority in its support, is that if a committee undertakes to legislate in an appropriation bill, the legislation must be germane to the subject matter of the bill, and retrench expenditures. That is my contention and if I can not maintain it I have no standing on the point of order.

A number of rulings have announced the above proposition. The gentleman from Tennessee made an elaborate ruling on that line, showing that legislation in an appropriation bill retrenching expenditures is not in order, if that legislation introduced in a separate bill would have gone to another com-

mittee. This case is precisely in point, and is found in the Manual, above cited, on pages 496, 497, 498. The point of order was to a provision containing legislation in a bill reported by the Committee on Appropriations. It was alleged to be in order on the ground that it reduced expenditures. The Chair held, see page 498, top of page, as follows:

The Chair is of opinion that the Committee on Appropriations may not under Rule XXI bring in as an integral part of an appropriation bill substantive legislation that, if introduced by a Member in the ordinary way, would go to another committee for consideration and action. Nor could a Member from the floor offer such an amendment, unless that Member offer it as a report of a committee, or as a member of a joint commission which would have jurisdiction of the subject matter under the rules of the House.

This decision cites an older decision to the same effect, as follows (see p. 499):

The Chair is of opinion that a motion of this kind should come officially from the committee having jurisdiction and can not be brought before the Committee of the Whole as an integral part of an appropriation bill reported by the regular Committee on Appropriations.

The facts in the case ruled on by Chairman GARRETT are precisely the facts of this case, and his whole ruling rested upon his answer to the inquiry whether the Committee on Appropriations can report a repealing clause in its bills even if it retrenches expenditures, when such repealing clause, if introduced by a Member in a separate bill, would have gone to another committee. Apply his ruling and the ruling which he cites to the facts of the bill before us. The repealing item is in the legislative bill. If the proposed repeal had been undertaken by a separate bill, as might have been done, that bill would not have been referred to the Committee on Appropriations but to the Committee on Ways and Means. Moreover, by Rule XXI, this repealing item must be germane to the subject matter of the bill. What is the subject matter of this bill? It is the various appropriations authorized by law and proper to be made in this bill. This committee has no jurisdiction to legislate. No legislation introduced by a bill can be referred to it. If it includes legislation it must be legislation within the limitations prescribed by Rule XXI. To what is the item under consideration germane? Not to the section, for it is the whole section, not to the preceding section, for it has no relation to it. Not to the subject matter of the bill, for that subject matter is making appropriations authorized by law, not legislating in regard to them. If this repealing legislation was attached to some other language making an appropriation in this connection, a plausible argument might be made that it is germane. But there is no such language. This is a flat repeal standing single and alone. It has no *pedis positio* in this bill. It is germane to nothing in it, and we are all agreed that this committee would not have jurisdiction of a separate bill to effect the proposed repeal. Moreover, this amendment is not proposed by the committee that would have jurisdiction of such a bill. Hence under Chairman GARRETT's ruling, however much this proposed repeal might effect reductions in expenditures, it is not in order in this bill. Further the facts in the ruling cited by Mr. GARRETT are identical with the facts of the present case, in that the matter held to be out of order was legislative matter contained in an Army appropriation bill, when the legislation proposed, if offered in a separate bill, would not have gone to that committee. (See Manual above cited, bottom of p. 498.) Bear in mind that the Committee on Appropriations has no greater power to include nongermane legislation in its bill, even if it retrenches expenditures, than a Member has to offer such legislation in an amendment from the floor. The language of Rule XXI makes that abundantly clear when it says no provision in an appropriation bill—referring to a bill reported by a committee—or amendment thereto—referring to amendments offered from the floor when the bill is under consideration—shall be in order. If this repealing clause, not even connected with an appropriation bill, be held to be in order, let us see what will be the necessary effects of such a ruling. It will make in order amendments from the floor designed to repeal any law under which the Appropriation Committee is authorized to appropriate, and pursuant to which it does appropriate. If this single item of repealing legislation, not even connected with an appropriation, is held to be germane on the ground that the committee has authority to make an appropriation for the officers proposed to be abolished, then, of course, with respect to any item actually making an appropriation under authority of existing law, an amendment proposing to repeal that law, or to repeal enough of it to eliminate some of the officials provided by the original act, would be in order.

The same ruling cited by Mr. GARRETT held further, with respect to another contention, that it was of opinion that the effect of reduction should not be inferred by way of argument, but should appear from the face of the bill itself.

If the Chair considers that the Holman rule should be strictly construed to eliminate legislative orders, I commend him to this conclusion of the Chairman in the case cited. (Manual, p. 370, middle of the page.)

On page 371, about the middle of the page, will be found a ruling relating to a legislative amendment to a sundry civil bill. The Chair held the amendment to be out of order on two grounds: First, because not germane to the subject matter of the bill—a sundry civil bill. Second, because it did not reduce expenditures. Suppose the amendment had been effective to reduce expenditures, it would still have been out of order as being nongermane. Yet this amendment, which was to an item in the bill for the recoinage of uncurrent fractional silver, was apparently more germane to that item than the repealing item under consideration is to anything in this legislative bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Certainly.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is familiar with the ruling of the gentleman which came up later about the Subtreasury. Does the Chair understand that there was any question as to the jurisdiction of the committee there raised?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I do not recall the facts.

The CHAIRMAN. If that question of jurisdiction had been raised—

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I do not recall whether it was raised or not; but if it was raised and I made an erroneous ruling, that fact affords no reason why that error should be perpetuated. I will look to that case as soon as I conclude this argument.

I desire to call the attention of the Chair to a ruling on page 372, which is an illustration of a germane legislative amendment reducing expenditures, and consequently in order under Rule XXI. I will reproduce the language of the Manual:

An amendment reducing the amount appropriated for railroad transportation of mails, coupled with a proviso directing the Postmaster General to reduce by 10 per cent the annual compensation for transporting mails on railroads was held to be in order. (Hinds, IV, 3891.)

In a ruling on the same page a legislative amendment to an item in the Post Office bill appropriating for Free Delivery Service, reducing that item, and making new provisions of law, was held to be germane, and retrenching expenditures. Likewise to a bill making appropriations to the Indian Service, an amendment transferring the management of Indian affairs to the War Department, was held to be germane. In both of these cases the same committee reporting the legislation in the appropriation bill would have had jurisdiction of that legislation if offered as an original bill.

On the decision in the case on page 371 on a legislative amendment reducing an appropriation, and repealing the subsidy act, the Chair held that as a condition precedent of order both branches of the amendment must be germane to the bill. The legislation was not to be germane to the bill. The legislation was considered not to be germane to the appropriation bill. Further jurisdiction of that character of legislation did not belong to the committee.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. LITTLE. If the committee simply failed to appropriate for this matter that would amount to a suspension for a year at least, would it not?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. That would be a suspension of the appropriation, not of the act. This committee could decline to make any appropriation on this matter.

Mr. LITTLE. If the committee should do that that would amount to a suspension of the law.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. This item does not propose suspension but a repeal of the law.

Mr. LITTLE. If they can suspend the law by implication what is the difference between that and repealing it? It is their business to take care of this matter in some way.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Permit me to call the attention of the gentleman to the language in the bill:

Section 1303 of the "revenue act of 1918" is repealed on and after July 1, 1920.

Mr. LITTLE. But they could refuse to appropriate.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Certainly. That raises an entirely different question. The one is a question of doing what the committee has the right to do, the other of undertaking to do something outside of its authority. The committee seeks by this amendment to exercise a jurisdiction by the terms of Rule XXI which has not been committed to it. If it merely declines to appropriate, that is an act within its manifest and undisputed authority.

Mr. LITTLE. The purpose of this is to save money.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I am not discussing the proposition on its merits. That would come up on a motion to reduce or cut out the appropriation for this official.

Mr. LITTLE. Neither am I. I am discussing the point of order.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. It seems to me that the gentleman is discussing the merits. I now wish to call the attention of the Chair to a decision to be found on the middle of page 373 of the Manual. In this case an amendment was offered as a separate paragraph in a deficiency appropriation bill. First, I will direct the attention of the Chair to the following language in support of my first contention, and another precedent in point, if the Holman rule is to be construed strictly:

Amendments providing new legislation must be germane to some provision of the bill and show on their face a reduction of expenditures.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman contend that what he has just read has any application to this paragraph?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I certainly do.

Mr. WALSH. This paragraph in the bill is certainly not an amendment.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. But whether a paragraph in the bill or an amendment from the floor the item must be germane. Moreover, this was an urgent deficiency bill, and the amendment did not come from a committee having jurisdiction of the legislation. If in this instance the item had been included in the bill the principle of the ruling would have applied equally as well. Inclusion in the bill would not have made it germane to the bill if it was not germane to any provision of the bill when offered from the floor. If it had been germane it would have been in order on that ground, if reported in the bill, and equally in order if offered as an amendment from the floor. A committee by including in their bill matter in excess of their jurisdiction can not make that matter thereby in order. Nongermane legislative matter in an appropriation is not in order under Rule XXI.

Again, on pages 496, 499, and 501 are three very elaborate rulings, two of them by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HULL] and one by Mr. GARRETT of the same State. I read from page 498:

If the Chair be correct in this, what have we here? There is proposed here upon this bill substantive legislation, not a reduction of salaries, not a reduction of the number of employees, not perhaps a reduction of the amount covered by the bill, though the Chairman does not deem it necessary to pass upon that now; but even if it were all of those, and in order to carry it out it were necessary to enact new law, to create a new industrial enterprise, a new project not now provided for by law, would it be in order? The Chair thinks not, except it be upon a report of the committee which would have jurisdiction of the subject matter if introduced as an original bill in the House of Representatives, in this case the Committee on the District of Columbia.

In this case the matter objected to was matter already in the bill—an appropriation bill. The discussion by the Chairman related solely to the point now raised by me as to an item in the present bill, namely, whether substantive legislation proposed in a bill reported from the Appropriations Committee is in order even if it does effect a retrenchment, if it is not upon a report of the committee which would have jurisdiction of the subject matter if introduced as an original bill in the House of Representatives. In his elaborate ruling Chairman GARRETT held that under the conditions supposed such an item would not be in order. In that case original jurisdiction of the legislation proposed belonged to the Committee on the District of Columbia, in this case to the Ways and Means Committee.

The case decided by Chairman GARRETT answers the query of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], since it relates to matter in the bill and not to an amendment. Further, the Chair held in language heretofore cited that if the language in the bill was offered as an amendment then in order for it to be in order it would have to be offered as the report of the committee having jurisdiction. The Chair will find a ruling on page 500, made by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HULL], touching this same question. I read as follows:

At this point another question arises relating to the germaneness of the amendment under a ruling which seems to be well established, and that is that without regard to the question of whether the amounts of the appropriations carried in the bill are reduced within the meaning of the third provision of clause 2 of Rule XXI, if the amendment constitutes separate, independent, permanent, substantive legislation, then, even though it should meet the requirement as to a reduction of the expenditures, it would not be in order unless it came officially from the committee having jurisdiction of the subject matter of the amendment.

It has already been pointed out that this principle announced by Mr. HULL as to an amendment offered from the floor applied to matter reported in the bill, if that was legislative matter belonging to another committee. Chairman GARRETT's ruling, to the same effect as Chairman HULL's, related to matter contained in the bill. Later the amendment rejected by Chairman

HULL was offered by authority of the Committee on the District of Columbia and admitted.

If the Committee on Ways and Means should afford authority to offer this amendment to this bill it would be unquestionably in order since it would conform to all of the rulings that I have cited.

Mr. GARRETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT. I understood the gentleman to lay down the principle that if this had been reported and offered upon the suggestion of the Committee on Ways and Means it would be in order, in view of the fact that that committee would have jurisdiction of legislation if introduced as a separate substantive measure. Would not the question of germaneness still apply?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Yes. The question of germaneness would always apply, have to be considered.

Mr. GARRETT. By the express terms of the rule the word "germaneness" is used. Now, it is an inquiry in my mind as to whether or not that legislation would be germane to an appropriation bill.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I have tried to point out that in the present connection here there is no environment, no preceding section, no portion of the bill to which this legislative amendment repealing an existing statute can be regarded as germane. But even if it were germane it would still be out of order, because the Committee on Appropriations has no original general legislative jurisdiction. It should come from the committee having appropriate jurisdiction.

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. Upon the contention presumably you could insert a repealing clause of an entire revenue bill in this section?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. If this bare repealing item is in order then the Appropriation Committee possesses the authority to report a repealing provision for any existing act under which the committee is vested with authority to make an appropriation. Whatever may be the existing legislation providing for officials, bureaus, or departments and authorizing the Committee on Appropriations to make appropriations in that connection may be repealed by repealing clauses contained in an appropriation bill. There is no escape from that conclusion.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair desires to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Certainly.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman does not contend it would not have been in order for the Committee on Appropriations to have brought in an appropriation for this service?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Oh, no; unquestionably such an appropriation would be in order. The jurisdiction of the committee is to make appropriations, not to legislate.

There is one precedent apparently at variance with Chairman GARRETT's ruling and the other rulings cited. I refer to the decision of Chairman JOHNSON, found on page 511 of the Manual. But that ruling may be distinguished from the present case on the facts upon the ground heretofore suggested by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON]. The facts in the case decided by Chairman JOHNSON are as follows: Mr. Fitzgerald, of New York, had offered an amendment to the sundry civil bill carrying an appropriation for enlarging the Capitol Grounds as authorized by an existing act. To this amendment the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson] offered an amendment repealing the act itself. At least there was something there to which it could be held that the Sisson amendment was germane, namely, the amendment of the gentleman from New York.

But in the case under consideration there is absolutely nothing in the bill to which the repealing item is related or to which it can be said to be germane. It is a bald item of repeal, standing single and alone, repealing an act originally reported by the Ways and Means Committee. There is no case like it on the facts in any precedent stated. It does not on the facts come within the decision of Chairman JOHNSON, and following the principles and cases which I have cited the item is plainly not in order.

The CHAIRMAN. It would be in order for that committee under its jurisdiction—

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. But that is not the line of distinction.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order there is no quorum present.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LONGWORTH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 12610, the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

#### WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a communication from the governor of the State of Virginia, announcing the rejection by the legislature of that State of the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the extension of the right of suffrage to women.

He also laid before the House a communication from the governor of the State of Arizona, announcing the ratification by the legislature of that State of the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the extension of the right of suffrage to women.

#### LEAVES OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. KREIDER, indefinitely, on account of death in his family.

To Mr. HAWLEY, for February 18, 19, and 20, on account of illness.

To Mr. RAKER, for the day, on account of illness.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, February 21, 1920, at 11 o'clock a. m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting estimate of appropriation for the relief of contractors, etc., for buildings under the Treasury Department (H. Doc. No. 656); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting deficiency estimate of appropriation required by the Bureau of the Mint for contingent expenses at the Denver Mint, fiscal year 1919 (H. Doc. No. 657); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting alternative estimates of appropriations required by the United States Employees' Compensation Commission for the fiscal year 1921 (H. Doc. No. 658); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

4. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting estimate of appropriation for the Washington (D. C.) Liberty loan building (H. Doc. No. 659); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

5. A letter from the executive secretary of the Interdepartmental Social Hygiene Board, transmitting report on the activities of the United States Interdepartmental Social Hygiene Board (S. Doc. No. 230); to the Committee on Appropriations.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. STEENERSON, from the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 9781) to amend section 217 of the act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the penal laws of the United States," approved March 4, 1909, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 662), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. ROSE, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 11834) for the relief of certain landowners of New Castle County, in the State of Delaware, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 663), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 11030) for the relief of the Woodford Bank & Trust Co., of Versailles, Ky., reported the same with an amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 665), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. McKINIRY, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 9048) for the relief of Catherina Rea, administratrix of the estate of John Rea, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 664), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

#### CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 10635) for the relief of Vincent L. Keating; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (H. R. 12495) granting relief to Lieut. John Sagendorf; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (H. R. 5745) for the relief of Dr. John H. Blackburn; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

#### PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WATSON: A bill (H. R. 12645) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of Churchville, Pa., one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McFADDEN: A bill (H. R. 12646) to amend and reenact section 4 of chapter 32 of the United States Statutes at Large, approved June 21, 1917, amending and reenacting the first paragraph of section 13 of the Federal reserve act, approved December 23, 1913; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McARTHUR: A bill (H. R. 12647) providing that the absence or illness of the President of the United States shall constitute inability to discharge the powers and duties of his office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MINAHAN of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 12648) amending title 2, section 1, of the national prohibition act, by permitting the manufacture, production, use, sale, and transportation for beverage and other purposes of beer, ale, and porter up to 2½ per cent alcoholic content by volume, and wine up to 10 per cent alcoholic content by volume, in such States as shall so determine by referendum vote of the people; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 12649) to encourage the development of agricultural resources of the United States through Federal and State cooperation, giving preference in the matter of employment and the establishment of rural homes to those who have served with the military and naval forces; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOORE of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 12650) to regulate the sale of milk and milk products in the District of Columbia, to safeguard the public health, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BUTLER: A bill (H. R. 12651) relating to married women intermarried with aliens; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FESS: A bill (H. R. 12652) to provide for the promotion of physical education in the United States through cooperation with the States in the preparation and payment of supervisors and teachers of physical education, including medical examiners and school nurses, to appropriate money and regulate its expenditure, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. HULL of Tennessee: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 300) requesting the President of the United States to call an international trade agreement congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By the SPEAKER (by request): Memorial of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, requesting the United States Shipping Board to cause the steamship *George Washington* to be repaired at the Charlestown Navy Yard; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LUFKIN: Memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, requesting the United States Shipping Board to cause the steamship *George Washington* to be repaired at the Charlestown Navy Yard; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 12653) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Kopp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 12654) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Popé; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 12655) granting an increase of pension to George W. Knizley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12656) granting an increase of pension to Harrison Roberts; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12657) granting a pension to Margaret P. Long; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12658) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of John C. Chamberlin; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12659) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Frank M. Vowels; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12660) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Robert Brodie; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12661) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Alexander Magruder; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12662) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Daniel Sullivan; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. KELLEY of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 12663) for the relief of John E. Walker; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 12664) granting a pension to Mathilda Wendorff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12665) granting a pension to Sarah M. Standish; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McARTHUR: A bill (H. R. 12666) granting an increase of pension to George W. Shepard; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12667) granting a pension to March Agard; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MURPHY: A bill (H. R. 12668) granting a pension to Ruth A. Burris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12669) granting a pension to Mary Orr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12670) for the relief of Henry E. Thomas; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OGDEN: A bill (H. R. 12671) for the relief of William Koop; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RIORDAN: A bill (H. R. 12672) for the relief of Helen P. Young; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SELLS: A bill (H. R. 12673) granting an increase of pension to Robert W. McFarland; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 12674) granting an increase of pension to B. F. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12675) granting a pension to Samuel Braden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12676) for the relief of J. W. Whisman; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TILLMAN: A bill (H. R. 12677) granting a pension to Elijah M. Smothers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1714. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Philadelphia & Reading System Lines, Federation No. 109, of Reading, Pa., favoring Government control of the railroads for at least two years; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1715. Also, petition of the employees of the Boston Navy Yard, and other citizens, of Boston, Mass., opposing the sale of the former German ships; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1716. Also, petition of the Douglas (Ariz.) Central Labor Union, favoring the seating of Victor Berger in the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Elections No. 1.

1717. Also, petition of the National Press Club Post of the American Legion, indorsing universal military training, etc.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1718. Also, petition of citizens of Alexandria, Va.; Washington, D. C.; Baltimore, Md.; and Strasburg, Va., opposing the

sale of the German ships; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1719. By Mr. CHINDBLOM: Petition of Donald I. Graham and 250 others, protesting against the proposed sale of the former German ships; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1720. By Mr. FOSTER: Petition of the Wagner Milling Co., opposing the Gronna bill relative to the wheat guaranty; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1721. Also, petition of J. M. Grover and other citizens of Bidwell, Ohio, opposed to universal military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1722. By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of John Hamilton, president of the local union, United Mine Workers of America, of Oglesby, Ill., and E. Hedland, of Rockford, Ill., against the Sterling-Graham bills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1723. By Mr. GOLDFOGLE: Petition of various trade papers in favor of the Fess bill relative to the postal rate; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

1724. Also, petition of Sam Ehrenberg, Aronoff Bros. & Wollman, Hayman A. Perelman, and Moey Baum, all of New York City, protesting against the sale of the former German ships; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1725. By Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Nebraska: Petition of numerous citizens of Henderson, Nebr., protesting against universal military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1726. Also, petition of postal employees of Omaha, urging passage of Lehlbach-Sterling bill; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

1727. By Mr. RIORDAN: Petition of the firemen and oilers in the customs service, New York City, relative to wages, etc.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1728. By Mr. TAGUE: Petition of Interdepartmental Union No. 202, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Boston, Mass., opposing the Sterling-Graham bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1729. Also, petition of the Boston Chamber of Commerce, Boston, Mass., opposing the Gronna bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1730. Also, petition of the Local Union No. 12, Plumbers, of Boston, Mass., opposing the Sterling-Graham bills now pending, etc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1731. Also, petition of the Massachusetts Real Estate Exchange, of Boston, Mass., in favor of Senate bill 2232; to the Committee on Labor.

1732. Also, petition of George F. Swain, LL. D., of Cambridge, Mass., relative to the Jones-Reavis bill, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1733. Also, petition of Adolph Lewisohn, of New York City, relative to a lower rate on income and excess-profits taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1734. Also, petition of William A. L. Bazeley, State forester and commissioner of conservation, of the State of Massachusetts, relative to the gypsy-moth question; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1735. Also, petition of various citizens of Boston, Mass., opposing the sale of the former German ships, etc.; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1736. Also, petition of Arthur W. Gilbert, commissioner of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, favoring an additional appropriation for the Bureau of Crop Estimates; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1737. Also, petition of Herbert F. Reinhard, director of the Motor Truck Club, of Massachusetts, favoring the passage of the Townsend bill; to the Committee on Roads.

1738. By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: Petition of W. R. Riggs, of Coal Creek, Tenn., opposing universal military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1739. By Mr. TINKHAM: Petition of New England Women's Medical Society, favoring an appropriation by the Government for board of social hygiene and for control of venereal diseases; to the Committee on Appropriations.